



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्यशासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड १७]

शिमला, शनिवार, १८ अक्टूबर, १९६९/२६ अश्विन, १८९१

[संख्या ४२

विषय-सूची

भाग १	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के उप-राज्यपाल और हिमाचल बेंच आफ़ देहली हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि	१०४१-१०६४
भाग २	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	और १०८१
भाग ३	अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के उप-राज्यपाल, हिमाचल बेंच आफ़ देहली हाई कोर्ट, फाइनेंशियल कमिश्नर तथा कमिश्नर आफ़ इन्कम-टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि	१०६४ और १०८२
भाग ४	स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन: म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाउन एरिया तथा पंचायत विभाग ..	१०६४
भाग ५	वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन	१०६४
भाग ६	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन	१०६४-१०६६
भाग ७	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं	१०६६-१०८१
—	अनुपूरक	—

१८ अक्टूबर, १९६९/२६ अश्विन, १८९१ को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'असाधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुईं:-

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
No. 6-57/68-LR., dated the 10th October, 1969.	Law Department	The Himachal Pradesh (Extension of Laws) Act, 1968 (Act No. 25 of 1969).
No. 2-5/65-LSG., dated the 14th October, 1969.	Local Self Government Department	Publishing the decision on the Election Petition of Shri Sunder Lal, President of the Municipal Committee, Nahan.
No. 1-8/69-LSG., dated the 14th October, 1969.	-do-	Authorising the Sub-Divisional Officers (Civil) in Kangra district to exercise or discharge the powers, functions or duties of the Deputy Commissioner within his jurisdiction.
No. 6-13/66-Elec., dated the 15th October, 1969.	Election Department	Republication of the Election Commission of India's Notification No. 282/1/HP/69, dated the 15th September, 1969.

भाग १—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के उप-राज्यपाल और हिमाचल बेंच आफ़ देहली हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार
APPOINTMENT (I) DEPARTMENT
NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 3th January, 1968

No. 11-4/66-Apptt.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Code of

Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Act V of 1898), the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri M. C. Padam, Magistrate of the First Class to be the District Magistrate of Mandi district, with immediate effect.

2. Shri M. C. Padam shall cease to exercise these powers after the assumption of charge of the post of District Magistrate, Mandi, by Shri D. S. Misra or his substitute.

Simla-2, the 9th January, 1968

No. Apptt. 3-148/59.—The Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order that the Director of Vigilance and Joint Secretary to the Government in the Vigilance Department shall also function as Director of Administrative Reforms and Joint Secretary to the Government of Himachal Pradesh in the Integration Department.

Simla-2, the 10th January, 1968

No. 1-12/63-Apptt.—Continuation to this Government's notification of even number, dated the 1st December, 1967, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order that Shri D. B. Lal, shall also perform the duties of Secretary (Legislation) to Himachal Pradesh, Vidhan Sabha, with effect from the 8th January, 1968 (A.N.).

M. M. SAHAI SRIVASTAVA,
Joint Secretary.

Simla-2, the 19th January, 1968

No. 11-5/66-Apptt.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 37 read with the fourth schedule to Clause (b) of sub-section (1) section 260 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to invest Shri Sohan Singh, Magistrate 1st Class, Sundernagar, District Mandi, with powers to try summarily, within the local limits of District Mandi, the offences specified in section 260 of the said Code, with immediate effect.

Simla-2, the 23rd January, 1968

No. 3-6/62-Apptt.—The Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri P. B. Sharma, Officiating Extra Assistant Commissioner, on his reversion from the S.S.B. Organisation, as Assistant Commissioner (Land Reforms), Himachal Pradesh at Simla in Class II (Gazetted) scale of Rs. 250-25-300/30-510/30-600-40-800/50-850, on *ad hoc* basis from the date he takes over the charge of the post.

Simla-2, the 23rd January, 1968

No. 1-10/62-Apptt.—In continuation of this department notification of even number, dated the 5th January, 1967, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh, in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission, is pleased to extend the continued *ad hoc* appointment of Shri Jai Chand on the post of Compensation Officer, Bilaspur district, Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh for a further period of one year, with effect from 1st January, 1968, upto the 31st December, 1968, or till the post is included in the Delhi, Himachal Pradesh and Andaman and Nicobar Islands Civil Service, whichever is earlier.

Simla-2, the 31st January, 1968

No. 1-9/67-Apptt-II.—Shri Shiv Dutt Paul, Officiating Deputy Superintendent of Police, Himachal Pradesh, provisionally allocated from Punjab to Himachal Pradesh on account of Re-organisation of Punjab State shall stand retired from service with effect from the forenoon of 28th April, 1968.

N. M. MAJMUDAR,
Joint Secretary.

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 3-13/69-Apptt.—Consequent upon the placing of the services of Dr. K. C. Thomas, Director, Central Water and Power Commission (Water Wing), by the Government of India, Ministry of Irrigation and Power, at the disposal of the Government of Himachal

Pradesh, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint (on deputation) Dr. K. C. Thomas, as Chief Engineer, Department of Multipurpose Projects and Power, Himachal Pradesh, with effect from the date of this taking over charge of the post.

K. N. CHANNA,
Chief Secretary.

Simla-2, the 3rd October, 1969

No. 2-9/64-Apptt.—The Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Captain Yogendra Singh, (BC No. 52219) on deputation from the Government of India, Ministry of Defence as Police Radio Officer, Himachal Pradesh, Simla, with effect from 18th October, 1967 (F.N.).

PRAKASH CHAND,
Joint Secretary.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-5, the 5th January, 1968

No. 5-122/62-Agr. I.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, with the prior approval of the Union Public Service Commission, contained in their letter No. F. 5/124 (133)/67 Apptt., dated the 13th June, 1967, is pleased to order the continuance of *ad hoc* appointment of Shri R. S. Rana, as Horticultural Officer (Raisin Grapes) Himachal Pradesh, in Class I (Junior) scale of Rs. 350-40-630/40-870, with effect from 1st May, 1967 to 30th April, 1968 or till Shri T. R. Chadha, reverts to the post, whichever is earlier.

Simla-5, the 11th January, 1968

No. 5-18/65-Agr. I.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh has been pleased to order the following transfers/appointments and *ad hoc* promotions amongst the officers/officials of the Fisheries Department, Himachal Pradesh with immediate effect in the interest of public service:—

- (i) Shri R. P. Arotra, Assistant Director of Fisheries, Mandi is transferred and posted as such at Palampur against vacant post.
- (ii) Shri Narinder Singh Fisheries Officer, Barot, now under transfer to Mandi is hereby promoted and appointed on *ad hoc* basis as Assistant Director of Fisheries, Mandi in Class II (Gazetted) scale of Rs. 250-25-550/25-750 *vice* Shri Arotra transferred. The *ad hoc* promotion of Shri Narinder Singh will be on purely temporary basis till such time the post is filled up on regular basis and as such he shall not claim any seniority etc., over others on this account during the period of his *ad hoc* promotion.

K. R. KAURA,
Joint Secretary.

Simla-5, the 15th January, 1963

No. 26-11/67-Agr. II.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the extension of the scope of agricultural activities of the Indo-German Agricultural Project in operation in Kangra district, which are presently confined only to the 7 Blocks viz. Kangra, Bhowarna, Panchrukhi, Shahpur, Lambagaon, Baijnath and Nagrota to the Una Valley comprising the three Blocks i.e. Una, Amb and Gagret of Kangra district of Himachal Pradesh also, with immediate effect.

By order,
B. S. SINGH,
Secretary.

Simla-5, the 16th January, 1968

No. 5-71/60-Agr. I.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the following transfers and promotions of Class II (Gazetted) Officers in the Department of Agriculture, Himachal Pradesh, with immediate effect in the interest of public service:—

1. Shri R. K. Rajoo, Assistant Soil Chemist, Chamba, is transferred and posted as Assistant Soil Chemist Sundernagar vice Shri R. S. Minhas, since proceeded on long leave.
2. Shri Sukhbir Singh, Verma, Senior Technical Assistant (Manures and Fertilizers) Office of the Deputy Director of Agriculture (Ext.), Himachal Pradesh is hereby promoted on *ad hoc* basis and posted as Assistant Soil Chemist, Chamba, vice Shri Rajoo. The *ad hoc* appointment of Shri Verma shall not entitle him to claim any seniority etc., over others in Class II Cadre.

Both the above officers are entitled to usual joining time and Transfer T.A., as Admissible under the Rules.

Simla-5, the 16th January, 1968

No. 3-186/67-Agr. I.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the *ad hoc* appointment of Shri B. M. Batra, Deputy Director of Agriculture, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh as Project Officer, Intensive Agricultural District Programme, Kangra, at Palampur in Class I (Senior) scale of Rs. 630-40-750/40-950/50-1200, purely as temporary measure till such time the post is filled in on regular basis either through the Union Public Service Commission or Departmental Promotion Committee, from the date he takes over the charge of the post.

The *ad hoc* appointment of Shri Batra as Project Officer, will not entitle him to claim seniority over others in the scale.

K. R. KAURA,
Joint Secretary.

**AGRICULTURE, ANIMAL HUSBANDRY
AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT**

NOTIFICATION

Simla-4, the 3rd October, 1969

No. 23-1/69-Fisheries (Sect.).—The Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh with the prior agreement of Union Public Service Commission, obtained vide their letter No. F. 2/26/(7) 69-AIS, dated the 26th July, 1969, is pleased to order the continuance of *ad hoc* appointment of Shri Narinder Singh, to the post of Assistant Director of Fisheries, Mandi, in Class II (Gazetted) scale of Rs. 250-25-550/25-750, for a further period from 18-1-1969 to 31-12-1969 or till the post is filled on a regular basis in accordance with the provisions of the Recruitment Rules, whichever is earlier.

S. S. GULARI,
Joint Secretary.

CIVIL SUPPLIES DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-4, the 6th October, 1969

No. 9-18/69-CS.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh that land is likely to be required to be taken by the Government at the public expense for a public purpose namely*. It is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be required for the said* purpose.

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Lieutenant Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts, required by that section.

Any person interested, who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within 30 days of publication of this notification file an objection in writing before the Collector, Mandi district, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.

*Construction of foodgrains godown at Mangwain Muhalla (Chhegla Muhal) Tehsil Sadar District Mandi.

SPECIFICATION

Locality	Khasra No.	Area in Metre
MANGWAIN MOHALLA (CHHEGLA MUHAL).	1218/1	1209.08

*Construction of foodgrains godown at Garauru Village on Jogindernagar-Sarkaghat Road Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.

Tehsil: JOGINDERNAGAR

Locality	Khasra No.	Area in Bighas
GARAURU VILLAGE ON JOGINDERNAGAR SARKAGHAT ROAD	225/1 226 227/2/1	0.6.16 0.15.10 1.09.01
Total	..	2.11.07

Simla-2, the 6th October, 1969

No. 9-18/69-CS&J.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, that the land is required to be taken urgently by the Government at public expense for a public purpose, namely*. It is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required urgently for the said* purpose.

The case being of urgent nature, it is directed under the provision of section 17(4) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, that the provisions of section 5-A of the said Act shall not apply to this case.

This declaration is made under the provision of section 6 read with section 17(4) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of this said Act, the Collector, Mandi district, Mandi is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

A plan of the land may be inspected in the office of the Collector Mandi district, Mandi.

It is also hereby directed under section 17 sub-section (1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 that the Collector may on the expiration of fifteen days from the publication of the notice under section 9, Sub-section (1) of the said Act, take possession of said land.

*Construction of foodgrains godown at Mangwain Muhalla (Chhegla Muhal) Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi.

SPECIFICATION

Village	Khasra No.	Area in metre
MANGWAIN MUHALLA (CHHEGLA MUHAL).	1218/1	1209.08

PRAKASH CHAND,
Joint Secretary.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 9th October, 1969

No. 1-10/69(Secy.)Edu-I.—The Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the retirement of Shri K. K. Gupta, Principal Government Higher Secondary School, Daroh (District Kangra), on his having attained the age of superannuation, with effect from 19th October, 1969 (A.N.).

Simla-1, the 9th October, 1969

No. 1-10/69-Edu-Secy.-I.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Article 520 of the C.S.R. read with Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs letter No. 23/66/50(C)101, dated the 10th August, 1959, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to accord sanction to the re-employment of Shri K. K. Gupta, Principal Higher Secondary School, Daroh (District Kangra) in service for the period from 19th October, 1969 (A.N.) to 31st March, 1970 on the following terms and conditions:—

- (1) He will draw substantive pay (or officiating pay as it was drawn continuously for at least one year before retirement last drawn by him minus gross pension, i.e., pension and

death-cum-retirement gratuity during the period of re-employment. His services will terminate on 31-3-1970 (A.N.).

- (2) He will have to produce the Medical Certificate from the D.M.O. or M.O. of the Illaqa concerned to the effect that he is physically fit and mentally alert.
- (3) His services will be liable for termination at any time without assigning any reasons therefor.

By order,
H. R. MAHAJAN,
Secretary.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 9th October, 1969

No. 12-1/69-Fin(R&E. I).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Rule 10-A of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1958, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare the Deputy Commissioner, Kulu, as the Head of Office/ Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of all Welfare Schemes and Programmes under the following Head of Account:—

(1) 71-MISCELLANEOUS:

- I—Miscellaneous and Unforeseen Charges.
- I—1-Expenditure on Welfare of Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Areas (Plan);
- I—3-Expenditure on Welfare Department (Non-Plan);
- I—4-Expenditure on Backward Areas (Plan);
- I—5-Care Services (Non-Plan); and

(2) A. Expenditure on Displaced persons.

- A—9-Expenditure on Tibetan Refugees (Non-Plan).

2. The Lieutenant Governor, in exercise of the powers vested in him under S.R. 191 read with Sr. No. 54 of Appendix 13 of P&T Compilation of Fundamental and Supplementary Rule Vol. III, is further pleased to declare the Deputy Commissioner, Kulu as Controlling Officer for T.A. purposes in respect of Class III and IV staff posted in the district.

Simla-2, the 9th October, 1969

No. 12-1/69-Fin(R&E. I).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Rule 10-A of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1958, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare the following Sub-Divisional Officers (Civil) who are also functioning as Settlement Officers, Consolidation of Holdings, as the Heads of Offices/Drawing and Disbursing Officers under Head "9-Land Revenue-C-Consolidation of Holdings" in respect of the areas falling under their jurisdiction:—

- (1) Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Hamirpur with his jurisdiction in Hamirpur Sub-Division in District Kangra.
- (2) Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil) Nurpur with his jurisdiction in Nurpur Sub-Division in District Kangra.

2. The Lieutenant Governor, in exercise of the powers vested in him under S.R. 191 read with Serial No. 54 of Appendix 13 of P&T Compilation of Fundamental and Supplementary Rule Vol. III, is further pleased to declare them as Controlling Officers for T.A. purposes in respect of Class III and IV staff posted in their respective Sub-Divisions.

Simla-2, the 9th October, 1969

No. 12-1/69-Fin(R&E. I).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Rule 10-A of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1958, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare the Deputy Commissioner, Sirmur district as the Head of Office/Drawing and Disbursing Officer under Head "9-Land Revenue A-Survey Settlement and Record Operations".

2. The Lieutenant Governor, in exercise of the powers vested in him under S.R. 191 read with Sr. No. 54 of Appendix 13 of P&T Compilation of Fundamental and Supplementary Rule Vol. III, is further pleased to declare the Deputy Commissioner, Sirmur as Controlling Officer for T.A. purposes in respect of Class III and IV Staff posted in the District under the aforesaid scheme.

Simla-2, the 9th October, 1969

No. 12-1/69-Fin(R&E. I).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Rule 10-A of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1958, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare the Tehsildar at Spiti in Spiti Sub-Division in District Lahaul and Spiti as the Head of Office/Drawing and Disbursing Officer under Head "9-Land Revenue-B-Land Records B-2-District Charges".

2. The Lieutenant Governor, in exercise of the powers vested in him under S.R. 191 read with Sr. No. 54 of Appendix 13 of P&T Compilation of Fundamental and Supplementary Rule Vol. III, is further pleased to declare the Tehsildar at Spiti as Controlling Officer for T.A. purposes in respect of Class III and IV staff posted in that Sub-Division.

3. This declaration will remain operative till a Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil) who was acting as such, is posted in Spiti Sub-Division.

By order,
P. R. MAHAJAN,
Secretary.

FOREST DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATION

Simla-3, the 30th September, 1969

No. 1-133/69-SF(Est.).—Consequent upon the appointment of the following officers to the Indian Forest Service Cadre of Union Territories, on probation, with effect from 1st July, 1968, vide Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Notifications Nos. 4/49/68-AIS(IV), dated the 18th November, 1968 and 25th February, 1969, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint these officers in the Junior time scale of the Indian Forest Service in the Himachal Pradesh Forest Department from the dates noted against each, as under:—

Serial No.	Name	Date of appointment
1.	Shri Dila Ram Dhiman	1st July, 1968.
2.	Shri Narendra Kumar Mathur	1st July, 1968.

S. S. GULARI,
Joint Secretary.

HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 29th September, 1969

No. 1-61/69-H&FP.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to allow extension in service to Dr. Amar Singh, PCMS-II, for a period of one year from 15-11-1969 to 14-11-1970 in the public interest, provided he is declared medically fit and mentally alert at the appropriate time.

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 1-133/69-H&FP.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Dr. V. K. Garg as Civil Assistant Surgeon Grade-I, in the scale of Rs. 350-25-500-30-590/30-830-35-900 on *ad hoc* basis for a period of one year from the 3rd July, 1969 (A.N.) or till the post is filled up in accordance with the Central Health Service Rules, whichever is earlier.

Simla-2, the 4th October, 1969

No. 1-206/69-H&FP.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Dr. B. N. Misra, as Civil Assistant Surgeon Grade I (Gazetted) in the scale of Rs. 350-25-500-30-590/30-830-35-900 on *ad hoc* basis for a period of one year from 1st August, 1969 (F.N.) or till the post is filled up in accordance with the Central Health Service Rules, whichever is earlier.

Simla-2, the 8th October, 1969

No. 1-177/69-H&FP.—The Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to accept the resignation of Dr. Mrs. R. Bazziel C.A.S., Grade I (G), Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Kotgarh, with effect from 16-9-1969 (F.N.), or from the date of relieving.

S. L. TALWAR,
Under Secretary.

HOME DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 11-89/67-Home.—In supersession of all previous orders in this behalf and in exercise of the powers vested in him under section 13 of the Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Act, 1956 (No. 104 of 1956) read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. 37-1/57-P.II, dated the 26th April, 1958, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint all the Police Officers of and above the rank of the Deputy Superintendent of Police to be "Special Police Officer" to deal with the offences under the said Act within their respective jurisdictions.

By order,
S. K. ALOK,
Joint Secretary.

Simla-2, the 8th October, 1969

No. 4-19/68-Home.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, (Administrator) Himachal Pradesh, that land is likely to be taken by Central Government at the public expense for a public purpose, namely for accommodation for Army Units at Pathankot,

it is hereby notified that land in the locality described below is likely to be required for the above purpose.

This notification is made, under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, as extended to Himachal Pradesh, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section the Lieutenant Governor (Administrator), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification file an objection in writing before the Collector of Kangra district/Land Acquisition Collector, Narpur.

SPECIFICATION

District: KANGRA Tehsil: NURPUR

Locality	Khasra No.	Area K. M.
DAMTAL	371/1	33 19
	372/1	9 2
Total	..	43 1

By order,
K. N. CHANNA,
Chief Secretary.

LAW DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 31st August, 1969

No. 3-15/69-LR.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 492(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure Code, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri Prithvi Raj, Advocate of Simla, as the Public Prosecutor, for filing and conducting a revision application, on behalf of the State in the Hon'ble Delhi High Court (Himachal Bench), at Simla, against the judgment dated 31st July, 1969, delivered by the Sessions Judge, Kangra at Dharamsala, in the case State Versus Subhash Chand, under section 307 of the Indian Penal Code and in the alternative under section 326/323 of the Indian Penal Code.

JOSEPH DINA NATH,
Under Secretary (Judicial).

Simla-2, the 5th September, 1969

No. 13-81/67-LR.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under sections 6 and 9 of the Indian Christian Marriage Act, 1872 (Act XV of 1872), the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to grant a licence, to solemnise marriages among Christians and grant certificates of marriages between Indian Christians, within the territory of Simla district, Himachal Pradesh to the following persons, who are Ministers of Christian Religion.

- Rev. Father, E. Ibrahim of Indian National Church, 501, Subathu, Simla district, Himachal Pradesh.
- Rev. Father C. Ibrahim of Indian National Church, "Asha Villa" Kasauli, Simla Hills, Himachal Pradesh.
- Rev. Father V. V. Morley, Indian National Church, No. A-9/33, "Summer Hill" Simla-5, Himachal Pradesh.

By order,
D. B. LAL,
Secretary (Judicial).

ERRATA

Simla-2, the 6th/10th October, 1969

No. 6-59/68-LR.—In the last line of sub-section (6) of section 12 of the Himachal Pradesh Home Guards Act, 1968 (20 of 1968), published vide Law Department Notification of even number, dated the 13th January, 1969, in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh Extraordinary) dated 17-2-1969, at pages 139-144, for the 9th word "fines", read "fine".

JOSEPH DINA NATH,
Under Secretary (Judicial).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-1, the 16th February, 1968

No. PW(R)123-281/66-II-5016-20A.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh that land is likely to be required to be taken by the Himachal Pradesh Government at the public expense for a public purpose, namely for construction of Theog-Kotkhair-Hatkoti Road, it is hereby notified that land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to the acquisition of the said land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Collector of Land Acquisition, H.P. P.W.D., Simla-9.

SPECIFICATION

District: MAHASU Tehsil: KOTKHAIR

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis.
PARSHAL	158/1	3 16

No. PW(R)123-281/66-II-6424-27-B Simla-1, the 15th March, 1968

Tehsil: THEOG

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis.
BASA BAGAIN	1049/956	0 3
	956/12 min.	0 2
	956/12 min.	0 2
	298	0 5
	299	0 2
	14	0 3
	9	0 2
Total	..	0 19

No. PW(R)64-23/61-7181-804B. Simla-1, the 20th March, 1968.

Tehsil: ROHRU

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis.
SUNDA BONDA	1272/11/1	0 12

No. PW(R)123-287-PF/68-I-4133-36D Simla-1, the 6th September, 1968.

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis.
1	2	3 4
SUNDA-BHONRA	542	0 4
	575/1	0 4
	574/1	0 3
	729/1	0 12
	730	0 5
	753/1	0 4
	801/1	0 1
	806	0 12
	745	0 6

1		2		3		4		No. PW(R)66-731-35 L		Simla-1, the 10th January, 1968	
								*Construction of Sarkaghat Road			
								SPECIFICATION			
								District: MANDI		Tehsil: SARKAGHAT	
								Area			
								1		2 3 4	
								Khasra No.		Big. Bis. Biws.	
								1 2 3 4		64/1	
								Village: RAKHOH		103	
								1261/1		88/1	
								418/1		436/1	
								1022/1		441/1	
								1257/1		507	
								1065/369/1		404/1	
								1063/369/1		572	
								1064/369/1		59	
								772/1		706	
								772/2		713/1	
								1066/369		713/2	
								1067/369		114	
								309/1		122/1	
								1029		733/1	
								1264/1		755/1	
								799/356/1		763/1	
								16/861/1		762	
								820/361/1		151/1	
								1012/1		722/1	
								1017/1		721/1	
								1260/1		679/1	
								810/321/1		440/1	
								800/356/1		416/1	
								817/321/1		415/1	
								819/321/1		557/1	
								815/321/1		705	
								821/321/1		759	
								795/356/1		121	
								1016		143/1	
								1262/1		657/1	
								1263/1		86/1	
								882/1		120/1	
								1267/1		443	
								380/1		40/1	
								378/1		403	
								65/1		585/1	
								1262/1/1		590	
								1262/2/1		667/1	
								1277/1		425/1	
								1278/1 min		428	
								1273/1 min		509	
								108/1		513/1	
								1220/1		513/2	
								370/1		515	
								1031/1		565	
										570/1	
										595	
										584	
										588	
										621/1	
										664/1	
										734	
										67/1	
										65	
										66	
										97/1	
										98/1	
										98/2	
										737	
										596/1	
										70/1	
										106/1	
										512	
										407	

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	No. PW (R) 66-18/66-8128-32-J				
								*Construction of Sarkaghat-Tihara Road				
								Village	Khasra No.	Area		
								1	2	Big.	Bis.	Biws.
										3	4	5
413	0	3	6	50	0	3	12	MANJHALI BANDAL.	6/1	1	11	3
557/1	0	3	6	516	0	1	12		7/1	0	14	11
714/1	0	17	5	560/1	0	0	6		7/2	0	0	6
757/2	0	0	7	561	0	2	12		7/3	0	1	0
101	0	1	8	599	0	2	19		76/1	0	0	18
449/1	0	0	7	666/1	0	3	4		77/1	0	0	14
555/1	0	2	1	614 min	0	3	9		158/82/1	0	0	14
352	0	1	0	861/61/1	0	1	12		166/83/1	0	1	19
778/1	0	0	7	417/1	0	1	17		171/83/1	0	2	1
15	0	3	6	414/1	0	0	9		191/1/1	1	4	17
115/1	0	11	2	411 min	0	2	14		Total	..	4	1
423/1	0	0	10	431 min	0	2	6	No. PW (R) 8138-42-J				
400/1	0	4	12	119/1	0	3	2	CHHABEHAR	6/1	0	1	2
562	0	1	14	411 min	0	2	15		7	0	1	19
563/1	0	2	13	614 min	0	5	9		62	0	4	18
571	0	2	1	104/1	0	1	2		14/1	2	0	18
763/1	0	3	17	123/1	0	0	9		Total	...	2	8
147/1	0	13	0	435/1	0	1	16	No. PW (R) 66-18/66-8143-47-J				
148/1	0	5	2	354/1	0	0	6	CHADWALKA	84/1	0	1	8
149/1	1	0	0	446/1	0	1	0		82/1	0	3	8
154/1	2	0	0	555/1	0	0	4		66/2/1	0	0	10
439/1	0	1	1	67/1	0	0	12		66/2/2	0	8	15
573/1	0	0	12	67/2	0	2	14		80/1	0	0	6
429	0	2	1	555/2	0	0	7		81/1	0	0	12
424/1	0	0	16	587	0	0	14		81/2	0	1	4
427	0	0	17	564	0	1	11		81/3	0	7	4
511	0	1	6	597	0	2	4	Total	...	1	3	7
556/1	0	0	1	431 min	0	2	5	No. PW (R) 66-18/66-721-25-K				
556/2	0	1	4	614 min	0	3	9	KANGU-KA- GAIHRA.	225/1	0	4	6
559/1	0	0	14	885/678/1	1	11	0		225/2	0	1	6
566	0	1	1	661/1	0	7	11		186	0	0	15
600/1	0	1	1	741/1	0	0	6		188	0	2	9
583	0	1	0	735	0	5	19		224 min	0	6	7
589	0	3	14	765/1	0	0	8		224 min	0	7	6
594/1	0	1	13	765/2	0	4	0		229/1	0	0	5
612/1	0	0	7	784/1	1	2	6		187	0	1	12
750	0	5	0	65	0	4	6		222/1	0	5	1
764/1	0	4	14	117/1	0	1	5		223/1	0	6	19
62	0	2	0	433/1	0	0	1		223/2	0	0	4
4/1	0	1	11	433/2	0	0	12		481/1	0	1	16
1/1	0	0	5	591	0	3	9		232/1	0	7	18
99	0	1	1	655/1	0	2	12		232/2	0	0	18
107/1	0	3	6	660	0	2	8		232/3	0	1	1
620/1	0	1	16	715/1	0	17	1		232/4	0	0	4
40	0	2	15	712/1	0	2	5		232/5	0	16	13
704/1	0	1	6	712/2	0	4	2		190/1	0	1	2
739/1	0	1	0	100/1	0	2	4		190/2	0	0	12
102	0	2	13	384/1	0	4	14		226/1	0	0	15
64	0	2	10	432	0	6	4		184/1	0	1	4
412	0	0	14	514	0	2	14		184/2	0	0	9
410	0	0	13	550/1	0	0	2		184/3	0	1	1
417	0	2	4	406/1	0	3	3		184/4	0	0	2
422/1	0	0	15	402/2	0	2	6		184/5	0	1	1
422/2	0	1	7	569	0	0	1	184/6	0	1	15	
422/3	0	0	10	558	0	2	1	184/7	0	0	9	
582/1	0	0	9	567/1	0	4	16					
381/1	0	0	2	613/1	0	3	5					
740/1	0	0	3	668	0	4	9					
736	0	4	1	707/1	0	1	7					
887/689/1	0	3	9	724/1	0	5	19					
887/699/1	0	9	5	510/3	0	2	7					
888/689/2	0	0	9	510/2	0	0	12					
766/1	0	0	14	510/1	0	4	7					
361/1	0	0	6	Total	..	35	7	16				
361/2	0	0	10									
360/1	0	2	1									
761	0	4	16									
426	0	2	5									
444	0	2	15									

HIHUN	927	0	4	1
	930	0	15	17
	960	0	1	18
	1002	0	0	10
	929	0	13	5
	926	0		16
	977	0	0	10
	981	0	1	2

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	1005	0	11	2	No. PW(R)66-40/66-243-47-J. Simla-1, the 24th September, 1968.					
	1107	0	10	14	*Rewalsar-Jamani-Sarkaghat Road					
	1109	0	1	10	Tehsil: SARKAGHAT					
	1226	0	1	12	KHUDI	372/219/1	0	14	0	
	1004	0	3	19		382/222/1	1	11	16	
	833	1	15	19		381/222/1	2	7	0	
	1003	0	4	18		380/222/1	1	2	4	
	998	0	4	13		383/222/1	1	6	10	
	1001	0	1	5		371/291/1	1	17	11	
	1110	0	3	9		374/221/1	2	4	14	
	937	0	1	10		370/219/1	1	1	10	
	939	0	1	15		Total	..	12	11	5
	999	0	0	10		KALAR	No. PW(R)66-40/68-100-03-J			
	940	0	1	6	511/1		0	15	9	
	942	2	3	3	506/1		0	10	18	
	978	0	1	10	507/1		0	18	0	
	961	0	6	10	512/1		0	2	12	
	962	1	1	3	513/1		1	6	7	
	958	0	4	17	594/1		0	0	14	
	959	0	3	12	Total		..	3	14	0
	979	0	3	13	No. PW(R)66-40/68-124-27-J.					
	983	0	3	0	BHADRAHI		1043	2	18	10
	1000	0	2	18		1049	20	4	2	
	1108	0	10	4		1042	8	0	0	
	964	0	1	7		1045	6	18	2	
	963	0	11	4		1046	5	8	15	
	1277	1	5	14		1044	2	13	9	
	941	1	0	2		1143	5	0	1	
	980	0	2	2		1144	2	19	10	
	1227	0	19	9		1145	3	3	16	
	982	0	5	12		Total	..	57	6	5
	976	0	5	6	No. PW(R)66-7/68-40-43-J					
	931	0	1	2	*Jogindernagar-Sarkaghat-Ghumarwin Road					
	831	0	7	13	BALDWARA	1985/1	0	1	1	
	832	0	0	19		1985/2	0	1	8	
	943	0	0	16		Total	0	2	9	
	897	0	0	9	No. PW(R)66-34/68-128-31-J					
	830	1	11	3	TRA (HAWANI)/41	880	2	5	12	
	834	0	16	9		746	0	2	2	
	928	0	18	5		1055	1	7	16	
	932	0	1	9		634	0	0	18	
	1137	1	11	7		753	1	17	11	
	1141	8	13	6		579	0	2	14	
	1113	0	9	12		580	0	3	0	
	1114	0	13	13		585	0	5	1	
	1111	0	2	10		596	1	4	11	
	1112	0	8	11		630	0	1	10	
	1136	0	3	8		881	2	5	1	
	1138	1	16	4		870	2	17	10	
	Total	..	33	10		871	1	12	11	
No. PW(R)66-34/68-9729-32-II.						884	4	13	8	
HAWANI/147	163	0	19	18		885	2	0	14	
	160	0	7	2		877	0	11	0	
	165	0	11	13		867	3	2	9	
	166	0	3	19		868	4	2	7	
	167	0	9	15		869	0	1	2	
	162	1	13	14		812	0	17	5	
	164	0	14	3		676	0	10	2	
	171	0	19	13		671	0	7	10	
	Total	..	5	19		873	0	6	8	
						622	0	2	3	
No. PW(R)66-34/68-9745-48-I					860	0	2	4		
SUNDAL/24	287	0	1	16	878	2	2	16		
	243/292	6	13	4	879	4	6	4		
	297	0	6	10	858	0	16	12		
	298	2	5	11	814	0	13	7		
	347	3	19	11	859	0	11	14		
	294	3	17	6	744	1	0	9		
	291	8	2	3	625	1	9	7		
	293	4	14	3	669	0	3	2		
	290	3	4	1	670	0	2	6		
	300	6	9	19	672	0	4	4		
	344/292	2	5	10	677	7	3	1		
	301	4	16	15	740	6	2	6		
	295	1	3	8	743	0	2	12		
	299	1	2	5						
	Total	..	57	2	2					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	750	0	3	3		61	0	7	5
	752	0	3	4		63	0	16	6
	892	7	3	13		99	0	3	4
	590 min.	0	4	10		106	1	5	2
	747	1	8	6		107	1	0	9
	592	0	5	15		114	0	13	4
	739	0	3	10		266	0	7	17
	918	4	3	4		267	7	0	19
	914	0	19	7		274	8	1	6
	590 min.	0	4	10		64	0	6	17
	578	0	3	11		105	1	5	6
	591	0	4	3		108	0	4	17
	595	0	3	12		116	1	1	5
	629	0	9	7		268	4	10	9
	633	0	5	14		271	2	15	16
	636	0	11	7		269	4	4	0
	663	0	6	8		273	3	2	11
	667	3	5	2		35 min.	0	2	17
	668	0	3	0		115	0	2	8
	498	0	2	8		35 min.	0	2	16
	734	0	5	4		95	0	1	18
	751	0	7	8		96	0	7	0
	683	0	8	17		98	0	4	9
	745	0	8	4		109	0	14	18
	577	0	2	14					
	594	0	12	1					
	499	0	5	13					
	593	0	2	15					
	664	2	8	7					
	666	0	2	5					
	500	0	12	2					
	673	0	3	0					
	674	0	5	12					
	737	0	3	7					
	621	0	7	16					
	628	0	2	8					
	631	0	2	5					
	675	0	4	18					
	681	0	4	1					
	738	3	17	13					
	919	0	9	0					
	920	1	9	0					
	433	0	1	11					
	434	0	6	3					
	437	1	5	18					
	440	0	16	11					
	441	0	11	18					
	495	0	13	19					
	497	0	4	10					
	598	1	4	7					
	425	0	5	3					
	426	0	14	1					
	427	0	0	15					
	435	0	10	18					
	494	0	6	10					
	496	1	19	3					
	597	1	6	8					
	428	0	13	11					
	429	0	1	7					
	430	0	7	3					
	431	0	19	2					
	493	0	3	8					
	665	0	3	14					
	813	0	12	17					
	Total	103	2	9					

No. PW(R)66-40/66-6094-97-J

Simla-1, the 9th October, 1968

*Construction of Rewalsar-Jamni-Sarkaghat Road

NAIN

482	2	14	1
487	2	17	7
443	16	2	18
495/486	1	12	7
494/486	0	17	0

Total .. 24 3 13

No. PW(R)66-40/68-6096-93-J

ROPRI

38	1	2	0
45	0	14	12
47	0	2	1
37	1	9	0
46	0	12	16
44	1	16	16
50	1	14	16
59	0	5	2
60	0	2	0

No. PW(R)66-40/68-6098-6100-J

THANA

851	1	1	1
852	0	3	17
878	5	5	7
881	3	5	15
882	0	18	14
884	1	3	10
847	18	1	2
845	10	8	7
879	1	1	5
880	0	17	1
844	0	8	7
848	3	19	4
877	1	18	13

Total .. 48 12 33

No. PW(R) 66-40/66-6189-92-J

Khasra No.	Area	1	2	3	4
1	Big. Bis. Bisw.				
2	3	4			
3551			0	7	0
3508			0	16	13
3541			0	19	3
Village: FATEPUR			0	7	0
3532	2	0	8	0	6
3533	1	7	18	3545	0
3535	1	2	16	3538	1
3307	0	0	15	3551	0
3311	2	7	7	3434	0
3312	0	6	13	3516	2
3318	1	6	16	3442	0
3319	0	10	7	3512	0
3320	0	6	11	3513	2
3321	1	18	8	3515	0
4105/3322	1	14	2	3511	2
3323	0	19	5	3534	1
3324	0	1	11	3467	0
3325	0	9	16	3468	1
3326	3	1	17	3469	1
3393	0	11	5	3471	1
3316	4	19	1	3510	1
3306	0	0	15	3547	0
3317	0	8	6	3872/3543	0
4106/3322	16	7	19	3889/3552	0
3353	0	1	8	3890/3552	0
3390	9	1	2	3892/3552	0
3295	0	5	14	3859/3470	0
3296	0	11	16	3461/3470	0
3435	0	2	11	3853/3470	0
3443	0	1	18	3865/3470	0
3480	0	9	0	3866/3470	0
3509	0	13	19	3877/3539	0
3507	0	4	5	3883/3537	0
3517	1	7	18	3876/3542	0
3546	1	6	6	3855/3472	0
3553	0	8	11	3886/3537	0

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3874/3542	0	15	18	3392	1	0	4	287	0	1	3	572	4	8	15
3856/3470	0	12	10	3457	0	0	15	387	3	5	1	954	0	2	10
3857/3470	0	5	5	3581	0	1	15	444	2	5	3	956	0	2	2
3485	0	3	17	3905/3583	0	0	15	445	1	18	12	957	0	6	17
3879/3839	0	6	9	3574	0	19	7	282	0	1	2	999	0	3	0
3882/3539	0	0	18	3907/3583	0	6	15	285	0	9	6	470	0	4	14
3854/3470	0	6	1	3579	1	17	14	452/276	0	18	5	510	0	6	12
3884/3537	0	8	9	3909/3583	0	14	13	248	32	1	14	987	0	9	6
3858/3470	0	3	1	3575	2	15	18	349	3	9	16	829	0	3	10
3862/3470	0	7	8	3580	3	2	17	298	12	8	15	846	0	15	4
3864/3470	0	4	1	3584	2	6	19	395/340	3	19	10	857	0	18	13
3867/3470	0	3	16	3585	3	15	4	397/3110	2	3	7	955	4	6	16
3873/3543	0	3	0	3587	0	2	18	241 min.	0	10	0	1012	1	9	4
3888/3552	0	7	4	3588	7	0	2	242 min.	5	6	18	1018	4	5	2
3891/3552	1	13	1	3557	0	10	14	241 min.	0	7	19	935	0	3	10
3852/3470	1	9	13	3582	0	2	10	242 min.	5	6	19	487	0	11	18
3860/3470	0	9	12	3555	0	7	10	422	3	5	0	485	0	3	12
3463/3470	0	6	7	3558	0	1	12	423	3	5	10	504	0	3	15
3868/3470	0	10	3	3903/3583	2	13	0	358	9	10	16	473	0	3	0
3472	0	1	12	3556	0	10	16	390/374	0	1	15	946	0	5	11
3875/3542	0	11	15	3903/3503	4	19	0	391/374	0	16	11	1016	0	12	0
3878/3539	0	4	18	3514	0	5	12	401/348	5	1	3	469	0	5	14
3881/3539	0	8	8					380/375	0	19	10	475	0	4	11
3540	0	8	8					227	0	12	11	489	0	4	6
3887/3552	1	17	17	Total ..	179	18	2	398/340	17	10	12	490	1	3	12
3473	2	2	8	No. PW(R) 66-40/68-6197-6200-J				399/340	4	10	19	507	0	3	9
3317	0	2	10	Village: PNAYALI				453/348	2	11	3	509	0	1	15
3327	1	16	17	139	0	11	3	362/196	0	9	8	992	2	0	17
3329	0	16	16	140	0	15	6	363/196	0	19	15	503	0	6	10
3330	0	1	13	141	0	13	9	398/340	2	0	19	1011 min.	0	13	14
3425	0	11	0	142	1	15	10	225	0	3	12	1011 min.	0	13	14
3426	2	9	15	145	1	15	2	476/341	16	13	19	511	0	5	10
3381	0	4	2	144	0	3	11	400/340	1	16	6	498	0	5	18
3385	0	1	10	148	0	5	12	466/341	1	13	19	993 min.	0	19	17
3386	0	2	10	67	0	8	4	186	0	12	15	993 min.	0	18	18
3387	0	1	9	70	0	14	4	190	0	9	7	488	0	2	2
3391	0	3	10	73	0	1	17	206	0	6	5	950	0	6	6
3408	0	0	18	76	0	5	13	300 min.	3	4	4	844	2	0	1
3414	2	2	16	81	0	6	10	300 min.	9	0	0	1056	10	18	5
3415	0	1	2	84	0	2	13	301	0	1	8	668	0	5	4
3428	0	0	15	104	0	1	13	302	0	6	1	724	0	9	15
3433	0	8	10	121	0	1	13	303	0	4	13	733	0	11	0
3448	0	1	18	129	0	6	1	304	0	0	18	491	0	5	1
3444	0	11	7	132	0	12	2	231	5	9	13	526	0	1	14
3388	0	1	12	64	0	6	12	232	0	18	6	656	0	1	8
3389	0	14	4	72	0	13	8	233	0	11	11	849	0	4	9
3380	0	2	18	74	0	4	6	234	0	3	0	520	0	0	17
3382	0	3	19	78	0	7	18	236	1	16	5	659	0	16	18
3409	0	8	3	80	0	1	16	237	11	14	3	528	0	12	19
3421	2	16	0	83	0	2	10	238	0	10	16	544	1	5	8
3429	0	1	17	108	0	2	15	239	0	10	16	727	0	13	4
3430	0	2	10	130	0	4	0	240	0	5	7	848	0	14	3
3431	0	3	1	107	0	1	4	443	3	18	4	516	0	9	0
3447	0	15	5	109	0	2	9	191	0	16	6	545	0	7	18
3449	0	1	9	131	0	3	13	192	0	11	14	515	0	8	16
3357	0	18	10	71	0	1	0	193	0	19	15	1068	6	12	3
3411	0	9	15	75	0	0	12	207	0	5	12	1067	3	19	7
3434	0	0	16	77	0	5	15	331/226 min.	1	16	0	1084	5	10	14
3356	0	2	0	79	0	2	3	332/226 min.	0	14	6	521	0	18	18
3363	2	3	12	83	0	3	4	333/226 min.	1	9	12	514	0	3	5
3451	0	7	17	105	0	1	10	335/226 min.	2	3	0	550	0	8	18
3453	0	1	18	106	0	15	0	336/226 min.	0	7	0	635	0	9	17
3453	0	1	18	133	0	8	1	331/266 min.	1	16	4	729	0	2	12
3455	0	1	18	134	1	5	11	332/266 min.	0	14	6	732	0	6	15
3358	0	9	14	143	1	4	5	333/226 min.	1	0	2	858	0	3	16
3384	0	3	2					335/226 min.	2	2	15	669	0	1	0
3410	0	3	10	Total ..	14	16	15	336/226 min.	0	7	0	838	0	7	0
3412	0	0	10	No. PW(R) 66-40/66-6193-96-J				331/226 min.	1	14	18	551	0	2	8
3414	0	13	17	Village: DOOL				332/226 min.	0	14	8	715	0	16	17
3322	1	5	2	368	9	4	19	333/266 min.	1	0	13	840	0	2	10
3427	0	3	0	307 min.	7	6	12	335/226 min.	2	2	3	1075	6	11	4
3450	0	12	14	307 min.	3	0	0	336/226 min.	0	7	17	1065	2	12	19
3456	0	0	17	307 min.	2	0	0	334/226	8	11	18	1061	5	16	13
3531	4	4	13	307 min.	8	0	0	347/317 min.	1	0	0	842	0	2	8
3536	2	0	5	307 min.	2	12	0	344/317	3	14	12	1004	0	19	14
3460	0	2	6	347/317	0	4	9	481/375/346	8	19	2	1017	2	12	13
3461	0	1	1	451/276	0	0	16	392/374	2	18	3	1005	2	10	3
3462	11	10	13	277	0	1	8	342/308	2	9	16	472	0	1	7
3463	0	1	18	286	0	10	1	Total ..	240	7	1	493	0	13	17
3458	0	1	13	288	0	2	4	No. PW(R) 66-40/68-6084-87-J.				502	0	9	13
3459	1	10	12	278	0	4	1	Village: GAHAR				472	0	1	9
3464	0	16	4	280	0	1	1	471	0	1	11	1006	9	0	8
3432	0	2	5	283	0	2	3	474	0	1	19	1010	0	16	5
3445	0	4	18	274	0	7	8	492	0	3	17	794	1	1	17
3446	0	9	5	282	0	1	7					803	0	18	11
3452	1	2	15	284	0	1	7					804	0	19	11

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5
795	0	7	12	843	0	7	1	975		0	3	16
513	0	4	8	994	0	11	0	990		1	5	2
519	0	11	14	996	0	13	10	931		0	4	7
549	0	6	12	1014	0	9	19	965		0	4	10
670	0	6	2	791	0	3	3	2674		2	2	5
725	0	3	13	792	0	5	10	2678		0	19	0
726	0	3	1	793	0	2	16	2682		3	12	1
728	0	1	7	800	0	6	11	2752		1	4	2
731	0	11	6	801	0	2	15	2671		2	18	14
741 min.	0	5	0	802	0	12	19	2680		0	3	17
774 min.	0	1	0	845	0	8	3	929		0	2	18
841	1	2	17	947	0	5	0	930		0	1	14
741 min.	0	8	10					919		1	3	7
774 min.	0	1	19					920		0	1	10
				Total	114	13	3	2662		1	10	7
								2663		0	4	10

No. PW(R)122-4/MD-6571-75 Simla-1, the 19th January, 1968

*Construction of Mandi-Simla Road Via Bilaspur.

Tehsil: SADAR

Village	Khasra No.	Area in Sq.Yd.	Sq.ft.
SIHAGLA TOWN	1810/1	101	3
	1810/1	154	6
	1810/2	122	6
	Total	378	6

No. PW(R)66-23/66-9609-13-G. Simla-1, the 20th July, 1968

*Construction of Mandi-Tungal-Thana-Dharampur Road.

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis. Bisw.	3	4	5
SAIN	958	1	0	18	
	2649	0	7	7	
	2648	0	8	0	
	2650	0	12	13	
	2652	0	7	2	
	2651	0	7	9	
	2681	1	10	0	
	927	0	12	18	
	937	0	5	10	
	938	0	18	3	
	936	0	9	11	
	934	0	6	3	
	934/I	0	13	16	
	939	1	14	15	
	935	0	10	10	
	2669	1	19	1	
	2667	3	0	16	
	989	0	19	16	
	951	0	1	12	
	2658	18	14	19	
	960	0	1	5	
	962	0	0	9	
	967	0	2	1	
	974	0	3	12	
	978	2	0	2	
	2655	1	1	15	
	2656	0	7	18	
	954	0	0	18	
	957	0	4	2	
	964	0	12	15	
	971	0	9	19	
	2675	1	16	13	
	2676	0	6	2	
	2677	0	4	1	
	2679	0	13	8	
	2686	0	7	3	
	928	0	5	0	
	946	3	8	5	
	2653	1	16	0	
	926	1	2	8	
	955	0	3	11	
	961	0	2	5	
	968	0	5	1	
	969	0	3	0	
	976	0	6	3	
	2657	0	11	8	
	953	0	2	0	
	932	0	14	4	
	963	0	2	6	
	966	0	1	11	
	970	0	11	14	

No. PW(R)66-40/68-509-12-J Simla-1, the 24th September, 1968

*Construction of Rewalsar-Jamni-Sarkaghat Road

DUSHRA KHABU	55	0	1	5
	56	0	2	0
	57	0	4	1
	58	7	6	9
	127	0	1	12
	106	8	8	0
	127/1	0	0	16
	117	0	3	0
	118	1	6	11
	114	1	8	11
	112	0	13	10
	113	0	1	17
	115	0	2	5
	32	3	17	10
	3	7	17	16
	10	3	8	16
	119	0	12	14
	Total	35	16	13

No. PW(R)66-6/66-96-99-J

*Construction of Mandi-Barot Road

Tehsil: JOGINDENAGAR

Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis. Bisw.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4		
Village: MODHI BAJGAN/		1187	0	0	13
458.		1196	0	1	19
	0	1198	0	1	7
	9	1159	0	0	18
	2	1161	0	0	18
	1	1163	0	1	2
	13	1165	0	1	13
	18	1183	0	1	8
	6	1186	0	0	10
	8	1197	0	1	2
	1	1199	0	1	0
	0	1182	0	1	5
	9	1210	6	17	5
	2	1211	2	1	8
	5	1213	2	1	18
	1	1207	6	5	8
	2	993	0	9	17
	1	996	0	4	7
	5	1000	0	7	2
	16	1003	0	3	3
	13	1009	0	1	8
	3	1015	0	5	1
	18	1024	0	14	5
	11	1027	0	4	14
	15	1029	0	1	1
	8	1031	0	1	8
	1	1036	0	1	10
	15	1038	0	1	0
	3	1044	0	1	0
	12	1048	0	6	18
	1	1052	0	0	19
	13	1054	0	3	18
	5	1060	0	4	16
	12	1062	0	1	6
	10	1065	0	3	12
	1	1069	0	3	3
	16	1071	0	1	4
	1	1072	0	3	16

राजपत, हिमाचल प्रदेश, १८ अक्टूबर, १९६६/२६ सितम्बर, १९६९

१०५३

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1075	0	1	4	1568	0	2	12	513/1	0	4	19	1126	0	0	12
1077	0	2	10	1562	0	4	13	544/1	0	0	7	1129	0	0	6
1081	0	6	13	1563	0	1	10	491	0	9	5	1148	0	0	12
1082	0	4	19	1565	0	1	8	551	0	1	4	956	0	0	15
1087	0	5	12	1567	0	3	8	550	0	1	0	960	0	3	17
1194	0	16	8	1561	0	7	18	549	0	1	5	921	0	1	5
1531	0	2	8	1215	8	11	12	914	0	0	16	848	0	1	2
1545	0	5	0	1212	2	2	18	551	0	1	4	921	0	1	10
1580	0	2	4	1214	1	19	18	550	0	1	0	1754	0	1	13
1185	0	1	6	1143	0	5	9	549	0	1	5	880	0	9	1
1544	0	1	10	1148	0	3	8	914	0	0	16	1124	0	4	9
994	0	3	5	1529	0	5	16	917/1	0	0	15	1160	0	3	15
998	0	0	18	1537	0	1	12	916/1	0	5	3	1161	0	1	8
1001	0	2	9	1542	0	7	15	916/2	0	2	0	1340	0	11	0
1005	0	2	6	1142	0	0	18	920/1	0	12	3	830	0	1	6
1007	0	1	0	1145	0	1	7	936/1	0	1	5	860	0	1	0
1011	0	1	17	1147	0	2	7	936/2	0	3	1	862	0	1	5
1013	0	1	5	1538	0	0	18	918	0	4	6	863	0	1	2
1016	0	1	0	1540	0	1	17	919	0	9	2	872	0	0	8
1018	0	0	18	1541	0	0	10	921/1	0	0	4	894	0	2	1
1020	0	1	0	1549	0	1	0	922/1	0	0	8	1153	0	0	4
1022	0	2	9	1141	0	0	9	465/1	0	3	0	1396	0	1	12
1025	0	0	16	1144	0	1	6	470	0	4	6	1402	0	1	1
1030	0	1	14	1146	0	2	1	515/1	0	1	7	1407	0	5	1
1033	0	1	12	1535	0	4	14	472	0	3	2	1374	0	0	10
1034	0	0	16	1536	0	0	10	514/1	0	2	4	815	0	2	8
1037	0	0	18	1539	0	4	6	516/1	0	0	6	861	0	1	1
1039	0	1	2	1174	0	2	7	464/1	0	0	2	864	0	1	16
1041	0	0	16	1156	0	3	15	471/1	0	2	14	873	0	0	13
1042	0	3	19	1172	0	1	1	474/1	0	1	15	1152	0	0	4
1046	0	0	10	1201	0	3	2	473/1	0	13	2	1157	0	0	5
1055	0	0	10	1154	0	1	19	517	0	3	12	1385	0	1	4
1057	0	1	4	1168	0	0	12	521/1	0	8	4	1401	0	1	10
1059	0	1	1	1170	0	1	0	586/1	0	1	3	1409	0	0	10
1061	0	2	8	1173	0	0	16	558	0	6	16	1413	0	1	16
1067	0	2	0	1176	0	0	16	559/1	0	2	13	1717	0	0	9
1073	0	2	9	1178	0	0	14	518	0	7	4	841	0	2	12
1074	0	1	2	1189	0	1	0	520/1	0	1	0	870	0	1	8
1078	0	1	8	1203	0	1	14	519	0	9	4	1344	0	0	13
1080	0	1	12	1204	0	0	12	543/1	0	2	7	1388	0	0	12
1084	0	0	15	1155	0	1	0	546	0	3	0	1398	0	2	15
1086	0	5	5	1167	0	0	18	Total	10	1	17	1411	0	1	9
1088	0	2	7	1171	0	0	3	No. PW(R)66-37/68-1755-58-J				1716	0	1	10
1049	0	1	18	1190	0	1	14	Village: BOCHING/416				866	0	1	0
1051	0	0	18	1202	0	1	14	353	0	1	0	896	0	0	16
1533	0	0	12	1205	0	1	10	1002	0	1	16	1155	0	0	9
1546	0	6	6	1157	0	1	10	1133	0	1	7	1343	0	1	7
995	0	4	1	1169	0	10	18	1143	0	0	6	1389	0	0	10
997	0	1	9	1175	0	1	5	352	0	1	4	1424	0	2	5
999	0	0	12	1177	0	9	8	702	0	2	17	1425	0	1	12
1002	0	1	14	1188	0	1	4	1000	0	4	18	1378	0	1	2
1004	0	0	12	1221	1	8	5	1001	0	1	14	1350	0	1	4
1006	0	3	14	1209	30	18	15	1134	0	1	3	843	0	0	14
1008	0	0	10	1224	15	7	11	1142	0	0	6	845	0	2	13
1010	0	0	18	Total	124	11	4	959	0	0	12	867	0	0	18
1012	0	1	10	No. PW(R)66-37/68-1759-62J-				997	0	0	11	895	0	0	16
1014	0	1	8	Simla-1, the 25th September,				699	0	11	18	1144	0	0	8
1017	0	1	15	1968.				347	0	0	12	1342	0	1	0
1019	0	0	16	*Construction of Ghatasani-Jha-				380	0	0	16	1345	0	1	2
1021	0	2	10	ringari-Tuni-Barot Road.				1138	0	1	14	1387	0	1	4
1023	0	1	12	Village: JILHAN				348	0	0	10	1397	0	0	16
1026	0	1	13	556	0	6	0	1136	0	0	15	1379	0	1	4
1028	0	1	16	541	0	1	18	349	0	0	10	813	0	1	1
1032	0	0	15	553/1	0	0	12	381	0	1	4	809	0	3	16
1035	0	0	10	545/1	0	8	18	1137	0	0	15	816	0	2	0
1040	0	3	13	547	0	1	10	1163	0	0	14	834	0	3	9
1043	0	1	10	475/1	0	1	6	1135	0	1	6	858	0	5	3
1045	0	0	8	548	0	3	2	350	0	2	0	835	0	3	5
1050	0	1	1	555	0	2	14	950	0	0	12	874	0	2	9
1053	0	1	12	557	0	0	15	1127	0	1	1	897	0	10	14
1056	0	2	12	499/1	0	0	15	1146	0	0	4	1028	0	1	10
1058	0	0	18	494	0	1	15	351	0	0	12	1151	0	1	1
1063	0	0	16	490/1	0	1	12	1128	0	0	10	1158	0	1	12
1064	0	2	12	496	0	4	10	1147	0	0	4	1383	0	1	0
1066	0	1	1	504/1	0	0	4	951	0	1	5	1392	0	1	6
1068	0	0	12	495/1	0	2	0	958	0	0	12	1399	0	3	18
1070	0	1	19	492	0	2	6	1131	0	0	8	1408	0	1	10
1076	0	1	10	503/1	0	1	0	384	0	0	8	1412	0	2	2
1079	0	3	4	493	0	2	17	385	0	0	6	1368	0	3	1
1083	0	2	5	501/1	0	1	0	Total				1375	0	1	12
1085	0	11	5	497/1	0	3	9	No. PW(R)66-37/68-1755-58-J				1003	0	3	12
1089	0	2	14	506/1	0	1	5	Village: BOCHING/416				831	0	1	4
1532	0	1	4	498	0	6	19	353	0	1	0	849	0	3	10
1543	0	3	2	552/1	0	1	10	1002	0	1	16	851	0	1	3
1217	7	7	0	489/1	0	9	5	1133	0	1	7	855	0	0	10
1564	0	1	18					1143	0	0	6	876	0	1	0
1566	0	1	0					1127	0	1	1	1154	0	0	8

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1159	0	0	12	792	0	1	7	1892	0	2	17	183	0	1	1
1394	0	0	8	795	0	0	8	1906	0	1	5	191	0	1	15
1404	0	0	15	765	0	1	8	1894	0	16	18	201	0	1	11
1415	0	0	15	775	0	2	15	1895	0	8	7	263	0	1	18
1010	0	3	6	779	0	1	7	1888	0	13	8	602	0	0	18
814	0	2	4	780	0	0	4	1893	0	10	6	151	0	1	1
859	0	1	4	782	0	1	11	1777	0	12	1	261	0	12	9
875	0	1	1	704	0	1	12	2497	0	5	8	309	0	1	10
1162	0	0	10	801	0	3	4	2503	0	5	18	222	0	7	6
1386	0	0	18	811	0	1	10	2500	0	2	6	223	0	5	11
1393	0	0	8	335	0	2	4	2484	0	1	12	249	0	6	12
1403	0	1	1	343	0	3	0	1771	0	9	2	251	0	3	11
1406	0	1	0	172	0	5	16	2486	0	2	5	252	0	2	14
1414	0	0	12	175	0	3	12	2499	0	2	9	257	0	5	17
1141	0	11	9	174	0	8	4	2487	0	2	4	260	0	5	14
817	0	1	13	315	0	9	12	2504	0	1	14	313	0	6	16
832	0	0	13	316	0	7	15	1767	0	2	17	353	0	17	14
844	0	1	19	318	1	1	10	2506	0	3	3	357	0	3	5
850	0	2	11	194/1	0	2	18	1774	0	3	16	608	0	1	16
869	0	0	15	192	0	1	7	1776	0	1	10	352	0	4	14
871	0	0	16	189	0	1	7	2498	0	0	14	232	0	3	1
877	0	2	2	184	0	0	9	1766	0	1	4	234	0	7	16
1139	0	0	12	270	0	0	15	2502	0	5	12	247	0	18	5
1145	0	0	6	278	0	0	16	1768	0	6	6	250	0	2	5
1346	0	3	4	290	0	1	1	2505	0	4	6	256	0	7	11
1384	0	1	8	194	0	2	15	333	0	0	14	258	0	8	5
1380	0	2	8	191/1	0	1	2	338	0	0	16	342	0	17	17
1395	0	0	14	183	0	0	5	344	0	1	19	356	0	3	8
1405	0	2	2	279	0	1	5	1763	8	2	11	310	1	10	3
1416	0	2	10	277	0	1	7	1765	0	1	18	312	0	6	6
1009	0	4	5	278	0	1	4	1764	0	4	16	351	0	4	1
819	0	1	0	185/1	0	0	19	1779	3	1	2	248	0	4	7
840	0	2	9	185	0	0	11	1845	0	7	16	259	0	14	11
868	0	0	16	280	0	2	16	1901	0	18	15	354	0	19	9
1140	0	1	11	272	0	1	18	1902	0	19	1	355	0	2	18
1382	0	1	2	129	0	4	1	1903	1	2	3	235	0	2	17
1390	0	0	11	186	0	0	18	327	0	0	18	337	0	3	12
1400	0	1	16	292	0	0	14	328	0	0	12	344	0	2	8
1410	0	1	2	292/1	0	0	12	329	0	2	10	360	0	2	16
1008	0	2	4	177	0	2	15	334	0	1	6	532	0	0	12
783	0	0	18	287	0	0	12	1241	2	18	7	614	0	0	15
818	0	2	4	171	0	1	8	330	2	3	15	139	0	2	1
1156	0	0	6	191	0	2	2	331	0	0	16	159	0	3	7
1381	0	4	0	187	0	1	8					164	0	2	10
1391	0	0	19	181	0	0	16	Total	54	18	14	170	0	4	15
1377	0	0	18	165	0	5	19	No.PW(R)66-37/68-1751-54-J				197	0	1	15
808	0	1	8	275	0	1	0	*Construction of Mandi-Barot				206	0	2	1
812	0	5	14	314	0	2	16	and Ghatasni-Jhatingari-Barot Road				212	0	6	19
1125	0	9	18	182	0	1	8	Village: CHELANG/425				224	0	6	3
1341	0	15	13	179	0	1	6	143	0	2	10	341	0	1	
340	0	0	9	167	0	1	16	146	0	2	12	603	0	3	6
339	0	0	12	285	0	1	6	149	0	2	8	606	0	2	8
341	0	0	16	289	0	0	10	153	0	2	14	20	0	4	4
346	0	0	12	320	0	8	2	174	0	2	17	132	0	2	15
343	0	0	15	178	0	1	10	177	2	8	17	138	0	3	6
345	0	1	4	182/1	0	0	15	184	0	15	4	158	0	3	13
332	0	0	8	170	0	1	1	185	0	4	15	171	0	2	0
337	0	0	18	190	0	1	10	187	0	3	14	195	0	1	12
336	0	1	6	169	0	1	8	194	1	3	14	205	0	4	4
378	0	1	0	281	0	0	11	225	0	18	13	207	0	6	5
700	0	2	12	274	0	1	4	264	0	3	17	219	0	2	12
701	0	2	2	186/1	0	0	14	575	0	16	2	338	0	1	7
703	0	2	10	193	0	1	12	140	0	2	8	343	0	1	10
705	0	3	3	188	0	1	6	142	0	1	12	605	0	2	14
784	0	0	12	180	0	1	10	147	0	1	5	607	0	2	9
786	0	6	9	166	0	1	16	189	0	1	4	130	0	3	7
787	0	1	1	168	0	2	5	227	0	2	0	162	0	3	1
802	0	9	8	282	0	0	19	190	0	1	16	136	0	3	1
810	0	2	8	283	0	0	12	18	0	1	15	199	0	1	2
323	0	3	6	284	0	1	5	144	0	4	13	204	0	6	14
776	0	0	18	276	0	0	16	152	0	1	15	560	0	1	12
785	0	0	14	273	0	1	2	176	0	5	10	601	0	0	15
778	0	0	12	271	0	0	16	179	0	18	0	604	0	2	4
796	0	0	14	286	0	0	18	182	0	3	12	137	0	3	4
346	0	0	14	288/1	0	1	14	186	0	1	1	160	0	2	0
767	0	0	10	291	0	1	12	188	0	3	5	198	0	2	5
788	0	2	1	293	0	1	2	202	0	13	11	214	0	4	17
777	0	0	19	176	0	5	0	226	0	5	3	531	0	1	2
797	0	0	10	173	0	2	5	262	0	7	11	561	0	1	15
790	0	0	12	317	0	8	12	141	0	2	8	131	0	1	8
793	0	4	0	1896	0	13	6	19	0	1	7	196	0	3	10
798	0	0	8	1886	0	5	8	145	0	1	7	161	0	1	18
781	0	2	5	1889	0	3	17	150	0	3	3	203	0	6	5
746	0	0	18	1891	0	1	12	175	0	0	13	529	0	2	8
789	0	0	6	1885	0	2	8	178	0	2	7	559	0	1	9
791	0	0	4	1887	0	3	16	180	0	2	10	163	0	3	2
794	0	0	12	1890	0	2	5		0	6	3	200	0	1	15

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
215	0	5	19	10	0	3	0	179	0	10	8	No.PW(R)66-37/66-4285-88-J.			
530	0	1	8	12	0	8	19	647	0	5	8				
1	0	14	16	14	0	16	14	789	0	2	2				
2	2	18	4	16	0	7	11	790	0	7	10				
4	0	9	9	24	0	2	8	808	0	1	3				
21	0	7	15	233	0	4	14	799	0	1	1				
37	0	1	16	236	1	8	13	170	0	3	2				
253	0	3	0	610	0	0	10	673	0	0	15				
254	0	0	16	616	0	0	15	798	0	1	4				
340	0	0	15	8	0	3	8	809	0	1	4				
339	0	0	12					865	0	1	19				
318	0	1	11	Total ..	152	10	8	203	0	11	1				
96	0	4	1	No.PW(R)66-37/68-4205-09-J.				674	0	0	15				
134	0	7	0	Simla-1, the 4th October, 1968				797	0	1	16				
155	0	7	8	*Construction of Ghatasni-Jhatingari-				810	0	1	4				
210	0	5	5	Barot Road				866	0	1	19				
213	0	5	13	Village: WARDHAN				169	0	2	0				
218	0	4	5	671	1	4	4	675	0	0	10				
244	0	1	8	792	0	4	7	800	0	1	12				
332	0	2	14	795	0	3	10	807	0	1	0				
345	0	1	5	779	0	6	14	676	0	2	2				
615	0	1	1	805	0	5	13	801	0	4	10				
157	0	6	1	785	0	3	12	806	0	2	12				
193	0	1	9	787	0	1	18	864	0	5	13				
208	0	2	16	143	0	3	8	788	0	1	18				
216	0	5	14	147	0	4	7	663	0	1	14				
220	0	5	1	152	0	10	0	653	0	0	15				
243	0	2	19	172	0	1	0	661	0	0	4				
333	0	3	4	182	0	1	12	654	0	0	6				
347	0	0	12	185	0	2	11	660	0	0	4				
528	0	0	18	174	0	6	17	655	0	0	6				
97	0	4	8	177	0	1	7	659	0	0	4				
133	0	11	0	498	0	9	8	658	0	1	10				
209	0	3	3	636	0	0	12	657	0	0	15				
211	0	5	8	644	0	11	16	791	0	15	18				
217	0	1	18	765	0	6	6	783	1	19	9				
221	0	4	14	794	0	1	16	804	0	8	19				
230	0	3	5	770	0	0	18	786	0	2	3				
331	0	1	4	772	0	0	15	634	0	6	14				
346	0	0	13	774	0	0	10	641	1	9	17				
348	0	1	11	776	0	0	10	656	0	0	18				
358	0	2	2	780	0	1	8	672	0	3	14				
359	0	4	12	784	0	0	18	861	2	11	5				
156	0	10	15	816	0	4	4	1017	2	10	11				
600	0	1	4	863	0	1	16	642	0	2	5				
317	0	3	0	144	0	4	4	648	0	2	8				
319	0	1	0	149	0	0	13	473	0	1	3				
27	2	17	3	150	0	0	15	480	0	0	15				
93	95	9	17	171	0	0	18	474	0	0	12				
241	0	3	0	175	0	3	7	476	0	0	18				
245	0	2	18	181	0	1	7	179	0	0	10				
328	0	6	0	183	0	4	12	475	0	0	10				
361	0	4	8	186	0	1	4	651	0	0	12				
238	0	1	14	646	0	2	4	637	0	0	7				
240	0	2	2	640	0	6	9	633	0	2	4				
329	0	5	0	762	0	7	7	650	0	0	9				
330	0	5	4	764	0	1	1	652	0	2	1				
363	0	2	0	768	0	0	18	1020	0	3	10				
364	0	0	10	773	0	5	18	1021	0	0	12				
334	0	2	0	775	0	0	9	624	0	3	8				
365	0	2	19	781	0	1	1	625	2	18	2				
362	0	3	10	793	0	0	16	Total ..	31	6	6				
237	0	5	1	803	0	2	0	No.PW(R)66-37/66-4273-76-J.							
242	0	2	3	145	0	3	15	Village: DALAUSA							
335	0	2	14	148	0	4	1	1141/1	0	5	13				
336	0	1	3	151	0	6	15	1134/1	2	6	7				
366	0	5	19	173	0	0	18	1134/2	0	1	14				
367	0	2	4	176	0	1	6	1137/1	0	4	13				
5	0	4	7	180	0	3	9	1137/2	0	4	14				
7	0	2	8	645	0	2	14	1138/1	0	11	3				
9	0	4	16	643	0	1	19	1139/1	0	5	10				
11	0	3	0	761	0	1	8	1130/1	0	0	2				
13	0	3	8	763	0	1	1	1127	0	9	12				
15	0	18	17	766	0	2	3	1130/2	0	8	2				
23	0	6	4	767	0	1	10	1130/3	1	3	17				
228	1	2	3	771	0	1	7	1154/1	0	5	6				
231	0	2	6	777	0	3	8	1157/1	0	1	1				
613	0	0	6	782	0	1	4	1158/1	0	2	8				
229	0	5	14	796	0	2	8	1159/1	0	3	13				
230	0	2	2	802	0	1	10	1133/1	0	5	3				
609	0	0	15	862	0	4	15	1140/1	0	3	1				
6	0	1	10	670	1	3	16	Total ..	7	7	19				
				778	0	4	4								

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1104	0	0	12	218/1	0	0	7	560/1	0	0	8	1638/1	0	0	6
1117	0	1	13	221	0	1	4	551	0	1	0	499	0	0	15
1128	0	0	18	229	0	3	0	544	0	2	8	648	0	1	2
1798/1	0	0	12	238/1	0	0	10	569	0	3	2	667/1	0	0	15
1800	0	2	8	249	0	0	18	516	0	0	8	638	0	0	14
427/1	0	0	2	255	0	2	0	655/1	0	1	7	498	0	0	10
1133	0	4	0	5/1	0	19	0	656	0	1	1	647/1	0	0	9
1136	0	2	6	6	0	5	16	1151/1	0	1	2	490/1	0	0	18
1787/1	0	0	14	7/1	0	14	1	575	0	0	14	491	0	2	4
1813	0	1	16	214	0	2	4	572	0	0	18	1107	0	1	13
1138/1	0	1	10	539/1	0	3	0	633	0	1	0	1178/1	0	1	6
1005	0	2	0	540/1	0	2	12	495	0	1	16	1142/1	0	0	4
1811	0	1	16	Total ..	6	15	10	493	0	1	8	1167/1	0	0	2
1820	0	0	15	No. PW(R)66-37/68-4281-84-J.				662	0	0	8	1098/1	0	0	2
1102/1	0	0	18	*Construction of Ghatasni-				663	0	0	9	514/1	0	0	8
1799	0	5	8	Jhatingri-Barot-Road.				658/1	0	0	11	634	0	1	1
1132	0	2	4	Village: GAWALAN				1140	0	1	4	494/1	0	0	16
1150/1	0	0	7	562/1	0	0	8	1139	0	1	1	646	0	0	7
1839	0	1	1	559	0	2	17	115/1	0	0	4	652/1	0	3	17
1782/1	0	0	16	637	0	0	9	576/1	0	0	3	666/1	0	1	3
1786/1	0	1	10	552/1	0	0	2	632/1	0	0	17	665	0	3	18
11/1	0	0	12	496/1	0	0	4	541/1	0	0	10	1104/1	0	0	13
220/1	0	0	18	649/2	0	1	12	1118/1	0	0	10	1106/1	0	1	16
222/1	0	3	12	1106	0	1	0	1130	0	0	9	1120	0	4	7
223	0	8	19	1105/1	0	0	13	1133	0	0	15	1170	0	2	5
224/1	0	7	14	1172	0	1	5	1138	0	0	15	1168/1	0	1	1
226/1	0	8	18	1171	0	2	16	637/1	0	0	7	1145	0	2	5
227	0	1	18	1179/1	0	0	9	542/1	0	0	18	1131	0	1	9
228	0	16	4	1166/1	0	0	2	1173	0	1	10	1147/1	0	0	8
229	0	7	19	1134	0	0	12	1174/1	0	0	5	1100/1	0	0	17
230/1	0	10	9	1137	0	0	15	1123/1	0	0	2	1136	0	0	16
231/1	0	8	13	631	0	1	0	636	0	1	7	565	0	1	12
232/1	1	2	9	574	0	0	16	678/1	0	0	12	566/1	0	0	13
1847/1	0	8	6	573	0	0	14	549	0	0	18	554/1	0	3	8
1848/1	0	12	11	635	0	0	18	500	0	0	11	629	0	3	9
1850	0	11	4	639	0	0	15	492	0	1	16	630/1	0	6	4
1851/1	0	5	18	511/1	0	1	13	1129	0	0	18	1646/1	0	1	18
1852/1	1	3	0	502	0	1	10	1124	0	1	16	1641/1	0	0	18
1810/1	0	2	0	508/1	0	0	16	1152/1	0	1	2	1125/1/1	0	4	9
1090/1	0	1	13	650/1	0	1	8	1645/1	0	0	18	1125/1/2	0	2	0
6/1	2	6	4	664	0	0	9	1644/1	0	1	15	555/1	0	2	5
7	0	13	18	661/1	0	0	6	570	0	2	14	556	0	2	13
8/1	1	10	19	1102	0	0	14	571	0	1	14	Total ..	8	12	9
Total ..	19	4	10	1169/1	0	0	5								
No. PW(R)66-37/66-4277-80-J				1132	0	0	14								
Village: CAMMPEN				1143/1	0	0	4								
204/1	0	7	10	1141/1	0	0	4								
206/1	0	5	4	1150/1	0	0	8								
206/2	0	2	2	1150/2	0	0	6								
208/1	0	1	13	1126	0	0	12								
211/1	0	2	10	1121	0	3	0								
212	0	1	6	1109	0	1	5								
220	0	1	1	577/1	0	0	7								
225	0	2	10	563	0	1	12								
242	0	1	4	517/1	0	0	6								
253	0	6	4	654/1	0	0	14								
256/1	0	5	0	1108	0	1	8								
223/1	0	2	12	1099/1	0	0	10								
228	0	0	15	1103	0	1	4								
237/1	0	0	2	1101	0	1	1								
241/1	0	0	4	1135	0	5	4								
247	0	1	1	1128/1	0	0	8								
251	0	0	6	1146/1	0	0	15								
12/1	0	8	3	1146/2	0	0	8								
13	0	3	12	1146/3	0	0	13								
14/1	0	12	14	1128/2	0	0	6								
210/1	0	0	9	1128/3	0	0	14								
222	0	1	0	1128/4	0	0	10								
227	0	0	15	564	0	2	5								
230	0	1	9	546	0	1	4								
248	0	0	18	550	0	0	16								
252	0	0	6	545	0	1	5								
258	0	0	10	510	0	2	1								
207	0	1	0	501/1	0	0	9								
213	0	1	7	503/1	0	0	6								
215/1	0	1	6	605/1	0	0	3								
219	0	1	15	657/1	0	0	9								
224/1	0	1	8	1110/1	0	0	18								
226	0	0	16	1127	0	1	4								
243	0	1	8	1144/1	0	0	6								
250	0	1	1	1149	0	1	16								
254	0	1	15	515	0	0	12								
257	0	0	13												

V. R. VAISH,
Secretary.

Simla-2, the 29th September, 1969

No. 1-102/69-PWD.—On his appointment as Assistant Architect (Offg.) in the scale of Rs. 250-25-550/25-750 vide Secretary to Himachal Pradesh, Government public Works Department's Notification No. 1-102/69-PWD, dated 9-9-1969, Shri Kali Charan Puri, took over charge of the office of the Assistant Architect in the office of the Senior Architect, Himachal Pradesh, Public Works Department, Simla-1, on the afternoon of 10th September, 1969.

S. N. BISARYA,
Under Secretary.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-2, the 17th January, 1969

No. 4-1/69-Rev. II.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh that the land is required by the Government at public expense for a public purpose, namely for the land to be acquired for Reservoir Area for Beas Dam at Pong Elevation Level 1280 in Tikka Mangwal, H.B. No. 12814 of village Bacholar, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra. It is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

SPECIFICATION

Tehsil: DEHRA

Khasra No.	Area		1	2	3	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	855/154	856/154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000	1001	1002	1003	1004	1005	1006	1007	1008	1009	1010	1011	1012	1013	1014	1015	1016	1017	1018	1019	1020	1021	1022	1023	1024	1025	1026	1027	1028	1029	1030	1031	1032	1033	1034	1035	1036	1037	1038	1039	1040	1041	1042	1043	1044	1045	1046	1047	1048	1049	1050	1051	1052	1053	1054	1055	1056	1057	1058	1059	1060	1061	1062	1063	1064	1065	1066	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076	1077	1078	1079	1080	1081	1082	1083	1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094	1095	1096	1097	1098	1099	1100	1101	1102	1103	1104	1105	1106	1107	1108	1109	1110	1111	1112	1113	1114	1115	1116	1117	1118	1119	1120	1121	1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132	1133	1134	1135	1136	1137	1138	1139	1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150	1151	1152	1153	1154	1155	1156	1157	1158	1159	1160	1161	1162	1163	1164	1165	1166	1167	1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178	1179	1180	1181	1182	1183	1184	1185	1186	1187	1188	1189	1190	1191	1192	1193	1194	1195	1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1211	1212	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219
------------	------	--	---	---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---------	---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
212	0	16	309	2	15	339	1	0	464	6	1
213	3	4	310	51	11	340	1	4	465	1	9
214	14	6	311	4	19	341	4	11	466	1	5
215	1	15	312	3	12	342	0	8	467	1	18
216	0	11	313	1	5	343	0	9	468	2	12
217	2	8	314	1	3	344	0	8	469	0	12
218	1	14	315	0	19	345	6	2	470	1	3
219	2	12	316	2	0	346	5	11	471	0	8
220	1	15	317	1	0	375	9	19	472	3	2
221	0	10	318	1	0	376	2	0	473	2	15
222	0	4	347	6	8	377	1	10	474	11	4
223	2	16	348	2	0	378	1	14	475	0	8
224	0	8	349	6	5	379	1	16	476	0	16
225	0	8	350	1	10	380	2	4	477	1	0
226	0	8	351	1	12	381	1	14	478	0	12
227	4	0	352	1	10	382	1	10	479	1	0
228	1	17	353	5	3	383	5	15	480	1	11
228	1	17	354	5	5	384	8	11	481	3	12
229	1	10	355	1	15	385	1	0	482	3	0
230	1	8	356	1	19	386	8	0	483	3	7
231	13	17	357	0	19	387	1	1	484	2	16
232	2	15	358	0	17	388	1	11	485	3	2
262	1	9	359	2	2	389	0	19	486	1	1
263	1	10	360	1	11	390	0	14	515	1	2
264	1	13	361	1	9	391	0	14	516	2	11
265	1	0	362	3	10	392	0	7	517	7	16
266	1	12	363	2	16	393	0	5	518	2	15
267	1	19	364	0	13	394	0	4	519	1	15
768	4	13	365	0	16	395	1	7	520	2	12
269	1	5	366	1	2	396	1	7	421	1	0
270	0	13	367	1	0	397	1	0	522	1	0
271	4	2	368	2	16	398	0	19	523	1	8
272	1	3	369	1	16	399	2	3	524	0	9
273	1	0	370	1	8	400	0	16	525	7	16
274	1	0	371	2	4	401	0	18	526	7	1
275	0	9	372	9	8	402	1	7	527	3	15
276	0	11	373	0	11	431	0	13	528	2	11
277	0	17	374	0	9	432	0	11	529	0	18
278	1	10	403	0	9	433	0	16	530	1	14
279	1	4	404	1	17	434	3	7	531	35	3
289	4	16	405	0	3	435	1	9	532	1	9
281	0	3	406	1	4	436	0	19	533	0	16
282	1	0	407	0	19	437	0	18	534	0	17
283	0	14	408	2	10	438	1	12	535	2	14
284	1	5	409	1	10	439	1	16	536	2	0
285	0	16	410	0	13	440	1	5	537	5	6
286	5	6	411	1	14	441	5	18	538	12	9
287	1	0	412	2	4	442	3	13	539	4	6
288	3	12	413	3	11	443	8	7	540	4	4
289	1	9	414	3	1	444	4	4	541	1	10
290	1	13	415	2	16	445	1	14	542	1	13
291	4	5	416	0	18	446	1	16	450	3	18
319	6	14	417	1	0	447	1	1	451	3	3
320	2	5	418	0	13	448	2	7	452	3	15
321	5	8	419	1	1	449	2	5	453	0	19
322	4	12	420	1	3	422	0	8	454	3	14
323	1	10	421	0	12	423	0	9	455	2	19
324	1	4	327	3	6	424	1	9	456	3	1
325	4	2	328	4	12	425	5	16	457	14	1
326	3	17	329	1	14	426	7	18	458	5	3
299	2	7	330	0	15	427	6	6	487	1	7
300	2	3	331	6	14	428	2	12	488	0	9
301	2	8	332	6	13	429	2	15	489	2	3
302	2	11	333	4	4	430	2	8	490	8	11
303	6	12	334	4	0	459	4	0	491	4	17
304	0	16	335	0	5	460	4	8	492	2	11
305	2	0	336	5	19	461	0	7	493	1	3
306	1	15	337	0	13	462	4	0	494	2	13
307	0	11	338	1	15	463	3	15	495	6	17
308	6	2									

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश, १८ अक्टूबर, १९६६/२६ अश्विन, १८९१

१०५६

1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
496	6	18	503	1	3	662	1	4	757	5	14
497	13	12	594	3	11	851/663	0	2	758	3	9
498	11	16	595	4	15	852/663	0	10	759	2	8
499	1	0	596	1	0	853/664	0	3	760	1	19
500	2	4	597	3	3	854/664	0	8	761	2	0
501	1	3	598	3	8	665	0	11	762	1	17
502	1	1	627	1	14	666	0	10	709	1	14
503	0	19	628	1	4	667	10	7	710	1	15
504	0	16	629	1	2	668	0	17	711	3	15
505	0	12	630	0	7	669	0	6	712	16	2
506	1	0	631	1	3	670	0	13	713	18	4
507	1	6	632	3	18	671	1	10	714	36	6
508	2	16	633	1	13	772	0	11	715	38	5
509	0	13	634	1	14	673	0	13	716	0	7
510	1	11	635	0	7	674	4	6	717	15	11
511	1	15	636	7	8	675	4	11	718	15	10
512	1	6	637	0	19	676	0	7	719	1	5
513	2	3	638	3	1	677	5	0	720	14	13
514	3	8	639	24	5	678	1	6	721	17	11
543	1	7	640	4	9	679	5	7	722	2	13
544	1	17	641	1	19	680	6	8	723	14	17
545	1	18	642	1	5	681	0	11	724	2	6
546	4	13	643	0	12	682	1	15	725	5	15
547	2	14	644	0	12	683	20	0	726	5	19
548	0	15	645	2	3	684	0	10	727	4	10
549	2	5	646	2	0	685	1	10	728	1	17
550	1	1	647	2	4	686	2	5	729	4	11
551	1	3	648	1	5	687	8	17	730	1	14
552	1	1	649	1	1	688	5	10	731	25	17
553	2	13	650	1	2	689	4	3	732	22	16
554	3	6	651	1	1	690	2	0	733	17	7
555	1	12	652	1	5	691	2	3	734	4	18
556	3	8	653	4	1	692	0	12	735	7	7
557	23	18	654	3	8	693	2	10	736	8	11
558	2	3	599	3	3	694	5	12	763	3	0
559	1	19	600	2	7	695	39	19	764	1	3
560	16	19	601	2	4	696	41	4	765	1	2
561	8	2	602	17	11	697	15	6	766	0	16
562	0	11	603	3	16	698	6	4	767	0	18
563	0	11	604	2	16	699	12	4	768	0	6
564	2	2	605	5	15	700	30	15	769	0	12
565	4	3	606	3	5	701	10	4	770	0	16
566	4	15	607	4	6	702	4	0	771	3	16
567	2	15	608	3	7	703	0	9	772	1	8
568	4	1	609	3	8	704	2	0	773	1	17
569	12	5	610	1	6	705	0	11	774	2	12
570	1	13	611	3	15	606	13	1	775	13	15
571	3	11	612	1	16	707	0	8	776	17	4
572	2	8	613	2	8	708	0	17	777	20	4
573	1	17	614	4	4	737	3	4	778	9	11
574	2	12	615	4	3	738	15	11	779	11	12
575	1	19	616	5	19	739	2	16	780	3	3
576	9	12	617	4	7	740	16	12	781	7	5
577	10	2	618	3	16	741	17	17	782	7	7
578	5	9	619	8	17	742	8	7	783	7	14
579	5	10	620	4	17	743	4	3	784	2	8
580	3	18	621	3	18	744	9	17	785	7	19
581	5	13	622	1	3	745	6	1	786	1	15
582	4	19	623	2	17	746	6	11	787	1	17
583	4	4	624	7	3	747	1	4	788	1	11
584	4	2	625	0	16	748	65	8	789	1	13
585	3	15	626	1	2	749	3	5	790	1	15
586	5	11	655	1	14	750	4	8	791	2	4
587	3	4	656	0	12	751	26	9	792	2	10
588	2	15	657	0	7	752	25	10	793	1	15
589	4	4	658	3	6	753	6	1	794	1	15
590	2	2	659	2	16	754	54	18	795	1	14
591	3	1	660	2	4	755	5	0	796	9	4
592	3	9	661	2	0	756	1	5	797	3	0

1	2	3	1	2	3
798	0	10	823	2	6
799	2	5	824	2	4
800	1	18	825	5	17
801	1	12	826	4	5
802	2	2	827	5	1
803	0	14	828	4	14
804	1	0	829	0	7
805	0	18	830	0	8
806	0	18	831	0	7
807	0	11	832	1	3
808	0	11	833	3	17
809	1	9	834	0	12
810	1	2	835	0	15
811	0	19	836	1	0
812	1	9	837	0	17
813	1	4	838	0	9
814	0	17	839	3	1
841	2	18	840	0	10
843	2	13	842	1	10
845	1	1	844	2	1
847	1	3	846	1	4
849	0	9	848	0	11
815	0	18	850	1	13
816	1	3			
817	2	5	Total ..	3209	14
818	0	13		304.53 Acres	
819	0	15		or	
820	0	16			
821	0	11	Kacha	Big.	Bis.
822	1	17		1461	15

Simla-2, the 18th/24th September, 1969

No. 16-4/63-Rev. I.—In supersession of the Government Notification of even number, dated the 10th February, 1967, and in exercise of the powers conferred by section 28 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1953 (Act No. 6 of 1954) and section 27 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 (No. 17 of 1887), the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to confer on Shri Sukhdev Singh, Special Assistant Collector Amritsar, the powers of Assistant Collector Grade 1st for the purpose of recovery of arrears of land revenue under the said acts in respect of districts of Kangra and Chamba in Himachal Pradesh.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on 1-8-1969.

Simla-2, the 18th/24th September, 1969

No. 16-4/63-Rev. I.—In supersession of this Government Notification of even number, dated the 10th February, 1967, and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (ii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (53 of 1961) read with sub-rule (2) of Rule (7) of the Income Tax (Certificate Proceedings) Rules, 1962 and the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. SO 2864, dated the 1st October, 1963, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh, hereby authorises Shri Sukhdev Singh, Special Assistant Collector, Amritsar, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Income Tax Act, 1961, in respect of the districts of Kangra and Chamba in Himachal Pradesh.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force with effect from 1st August, 1969.

By order,
U. N. SHARMA,
Secretary.

Simla-2, the 25th September, 1969

No. 6-19/69-Rev. I.—The War Jagirs of the annual amount of Rs. 100.00 (Rupees one hundred) only in each case, sanctioned in respect of the following persons appearing in this Department notifications noted against each, are hereby cancelled:—

Sl. No.	Name and address of the grantee	Notification No. and date
1	2	3
1.	Shri Lachman Singh s/o Shri Gobind Singh of Village Taropka, Tehsil Hamirpur, District Kangra.	No. 6-10/68 (V), dated 22-11-1968.

1	2	3
2.	Shrimati Shankari Devi wd/o Shri Lachhman Singh of Village Ghamarli, Tehsil Hamirpur, District Kangra, H.P.	No. 6-22/68-Rev. I, (II), dated 1-1-1969.
3.	Shri Nathu Ram s/o Shri Manorath Ram of Village Badoh-Bhadarkali, Tehsil Hamirpur, District Kangra.	No. 6-11/68-Rev. I, dated 31-5-1968.
4.	Shri Dalla Ram s/o Shri Gwararu of Village Karsoh, Tehsil Hamirpur, District Kangra.	No. 6-352/67-Rev. I (7), dated 28-9-19 7.

Simla-2, the 25th September, 1969

No. 6-3/69-Rev. I(II).—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 (1-A)/3(1)(a)/3(1)(b) of the East Punjab War Awards Act, 1948, read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make a grant of War Jagirs of the annual value of Rs. 100.00 each (Rupees one hundred) only in favour of the undermentioned persons as award for war services rendered by their respective sons/sons subject to such conditions as to its enjoyment as are continued in their respective Sanads of the Jagir granted to them in this behalf:—

Sl. No.	No. of sons in Armed Forces	Name/parentage of the grantee	Particulars about residence	Annual amount of War Jagir effective
1	2	3	Village/Tehsil of District Kangra	Rabi/Kharif
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Four	Smt. Nanki Devi wd/o Shri Gulab Singh.	Ler Santla, Dehra.	Rs. 140 (Kharif, 1964).
2.	One	Shri Sant Ram Jaggi s/o Shri Narainoo.	Panjara, Dehra.	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
3.	One	Shri Chur Singh s/o Shri Kirhu.	Muhal, Dehra	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965).
4.	One	Shrimati Bhilo Devi wd/o Shri Ram Dittu.	Maniala, Dehra.	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965).

Simla-2, the 27th September, 1969

No. 6-18/69(Rev.) I.—Consequent upon the death of Shri Bhagat Ram s/o Shri Thakur Dass, Village Amlehar, Tehsil Una, District Kangra, on 2-4-1969, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh in exercise of the powers conferred upon him vide section 2(a)(i) and 3(1)(a) read with proviso to section 4 of the East Punjab Awards Act, 1948 and Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, is pleased to order that the War Jagir of the Annual value of Rs. 100 (Rupees one hundred) per annum sanctioned in his favour with effect from Kharif 1964 vide Himachal Pradesh Government Notification No. 6-355/67 (Rev. I) (V)-II, dated 2-3-1968 shall now continue in favour of Smt. Lachmi Devi widow of the said Shri Bhagat Ram with effect from Kharif, 1964 subject to the conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in the Sanad of the Jagir granted to her.

S. N. BISARYA,
Under Secretary.

Simla-2, the 29th August, 1969

No. 2-9/64-Rev. I(III).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 27(1)(b) of the Punjab Land Revenue (Act XVII of 1887) as in force in the territories transferred to Himachal Pradesh with effect from 1-11-1966 as a result of re-organisation of States and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to confer on the following officers all the powers of Assistant Collector 1st Grade under the said Act to be exercised by them within the local limits of their respective jurisdiction as specified

against each, from the date they took over the charge of the post:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer	Area of Jurisdiction
1.	Shri I. D. Kaushesh, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kandaghat.	Kandaghat Sub-Division, District Simla.
2.	Shri D. K. Khanna, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nalagarh.	Nalagarh Sub-Division, District Simla.
3.	Shri Y. R. Mahajan, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Hamirpur.	Hamirpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
4.	Shri R. S. Guleria, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nurpur.	Nurpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
5.	Shri K. C. Sharma Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kangra.	Kangra Sub-Division, District Kangra.

Simla-2, the 29th August, 1969

No. 2-9/64-Rev. I(III).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 27(1)(a) of the Punjab Land Revenue (Act XVII of 1887) as in force in the territories transferred to Himachal Pradesh with effect from 1-11-1966 as a result of the re-organisation of states, and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor) Himachal Pradesh is pleased to confer on the following officers all the powers of Collector under the said Act to be exercised by them within the local limits of their respective jurisdictions as specified against each, a subject to the control of the Collector of the District, from the date they took over the charge of the post:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer	Area of jurisdiction
1.	Shri I. D. Kaushesh, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kandaghat.	Kandaghat Sub-Division, District Simla.
2.	Shri D. K. Khanna, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nalagarh.	Nalagarh Sub-Division, District Simla.
3.	Shri Y. R. Mahajan, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Hamirpur.	Hamirpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
4.	Shri R. S. Guleria, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nurpur.	Nurpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
5.	Shri K. C. Sharma, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kangra.	Kangra Sub-Division, District Kangra.

Simla-2, the 29th August, 1969

No. 2-9/64-Rev. I(III).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 2(b) of the Punjab Occupancy Tenants (Vesting of Proprietary Rights) Act, 1952, as in force in the territories transferred to Himachal Pradesh with effect from 1-11-1966 as a result of the re-organisation of States and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to specially empower the following officers to perform the duties of a Collector under the said Act to be exercised by them within the local limits of their respective jurisdictions as specified against each from

the date they took over the charge of the post:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer	Area of jurisdiction
1.	Shri I. D. Kaushesh, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kandaghat.	Kandaghat Sub-Division, District Simla.
2.	Shri D. K. Khanna, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nalagarh.	Nalagarh Sub-Division, District Simla.
3.	Shri Y. R. Mahajan, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Hamirpur.	Hamirpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
4.	Shri R. S. Guleria, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nurpur.	Nurpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
5.	Shri K. C. Sharma, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kangra.	Kangra Sub-Division, District Kangra.

Simla-2, the 29th August, 1969

No. 2-9/64-Rev. I(III).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 3(2) of the Punjab Restitution of Mortgaged Lands Act, 1938, as in force in the territories transferred to Himachal Pradesh with effect from 1-11-1966 as a result of the re-organisation of States and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to specifically empower the following officers to perform the duties of the Collector for the purpose of the said Act to be exercised by them within the local limits of their respective jurisdiction as specified against each from the date they took over the charge of the post:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer	Area of jurisdiction
1.	Shri I. D. Kaushesh, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kandaghat.	Kandaghat Sub-Division, District Simla.
2.	Shri D. K. Khanna Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nalagarh.	Sub-Division, Nalagarh, District Simla.
3.	Shri Y. R. Mahajan Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Hamirpur.	Hamirpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
4.	Shri R. S. Guleria, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nurpur.	Nurpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
5.	Shri K. C. Sharma, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kangra.	Kangra Sub-Division, District Kangra.

Simla-2, the 29th August, 1969

No. 2-9/64-Rev. I(III).—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 2(c) of the Punjab Abolition of Ala Malkiyat and Talukdari Rights Act, 1952, as in force in the territories transferred to Himachal Pradesh with effect from 1-11-1966 as a result of the re-organisation of States and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor) Himachal Pradesh is pleased to specifically empower the following officers to perform the duties of Collector under the said Act to be exercised by them within the local limits of their respective

jurisdictions as specified against each from the date they took over the charge of the post:—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer	Area of jurisdiction
1.	Shri I. D. Kaushesh, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kandaghat.	Kandaghat Sub-Division, District Simla.
2.	Shri D. K. Khanna, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nalagarh.	Nalagarh Sub-Division, District Simla.
3.	Shri Y. R. Mahajan, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Hamirpur.	Hamirpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
4.	Shri R. S. Guleria, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Nurpur.	Nurpur Sub-Division, District Kangra.
5.	Shri K. C. Sharma, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Kangra.	Kangra Sub-Division, District Kangra.

Simla-2, the 3rd September, 1969

No. 4-36/69-Rev. II.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, that land is likely to be required to be taken by the Himachal Pradesh Government at the public expense for a public purpose, namely for the land to be acquired for Reservoir Area for Beas Dam at Pong Elevation Level 1430 in Tikka Harian, H.B. No. 71/12, of Village Anmul, Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra. It is hereby notified that land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to the

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 6-4/69(Rev. I)(II).—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3(1-A)/3(1)(a)/3(1)(b)(i) of the East Punjab War Awards Act, 1948, read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, the

acquisition of the said land in the locality may, within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township.

SPECIFICATION

District: KANGRA *Tehsil:* NURPUR

Village	Khasra No.	H.B. No.	Area K.	Area M.	Area in acres
TIKKA	612	71/12	5	17	13.17
HARIAN	613		67	8	
OF VILLAGE	614		4	3	
ANMUL	615		66	13	
Total	..	144	1		

By order,
H. R. MAHAJAN,
Secretary.

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 6-1/69(Rev. I).—Consequent upon the death of Shri Narain Dass s/o Shri Saraf, Village Rajot, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra on 5-8-1969, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers conferred upon him vide section 2(a)(i) and 3(1) (a) read with proviso to section 4, of the East Punjab Awards Act, 1948 and Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, is pleased to order that the War Jagir of the annual value of Rs. 100.00 (Rupees one hundred) sanctioned in his favour with effect from Kharif 1964 vide Punjab Government Notification No. 10892-JN(iii)65/8627, dated 16-11-1965 shall now continue in favour of Smt. Durgi Devi widow of the said Shri Narain Dass with effect from Kharif 1967, subject to the conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in the Sanad of the Jagir granted to her.

Simla-2, the 10th September, 1969

No. 6-1/69(Rev. I).—Consequent upon the death of Shri Govind Rams/o Shri Sajnu Ram, Village Dhalera, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra on 29-4-1969, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers conferred upon him vide section 2(a)(i) and 3(1)(a) read with proviso to section 4, of the East Punjab Awards Act, 1948 and Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, is pleased to order that the War Jagir of the annual value of Rs. 100.00 (Rupees one hundred) sanctioned in his favour with effect from Kharif 1965 vide Punjab Government Notification No. 17132. JN(II)66/19647, dated 21-9-1966, shall now continue in favour of Smt. Goghan Devi widow of the said Shri Govind Ram with effect from Kharif 1965 subject to the conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in the Sanad of the Jagir granted to her.

Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make grant of War Jagirs of the annual value of Rs. 100.00 each (Rupees one hundred) only in favour of the undermentioned persons as award for War Services rendered by their respective son/sons subject to such conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in their respective Sanads of the Jagir granted to them in this behalf:—

Serial No.	No. of sons in Armed Forces	Name/parentage of the grantee	Particulars about residence	Annual amount of War Jagir effective
			Village/Tehsil of District Kangra	Rabi/Kharif
1.	One	Shri Prabhu Ram s/o Shri Gosanu	Kadhyar, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
2.	One	Smt. Rubhli Devi wd/o Shri Chaudhari Ram	Telkar, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
3.	One	Smt. Bhagti Devi wd/o Shri Hari Ram	Jamnoti, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
4.	One	Shri Tulsu Ram s/o Shri Indar	Halana, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
5.	One	Smt. Surtaj Devi wd/o Shri Fateh Singh	Amtar, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
6.	Three	Shri Munshi Ram s/o Shri Khazana Ram.	Ganoh, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 6-4/69 (Rev. I) (III).—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3(1-A)/3(1)(a)/3(1)(b)(i) of the East Punjab War Awards Act, 1948, read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, the

Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make grant of War Jagirs of the annual value of Rs. 100.00 each (Rupees one hundred) only in favour of the undermentioned persons as award for War Services rendered by their respective son/sons subject to such conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in their respective Sanads of the Jagir granted to them in this behalf:—

Serial No.	No. of sons in Armed Forces	Name/parentage of the grantee	Particulars about residence	Annual amount of War Jagir effective
			Village/Tehsil of District Kangra	
1.	One	Smt. Bhagwani Devi wd/o Shri Moti Ram.	Kamlah, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
2.	One	Shri Ganga Ram s/o Shri Tota Ram	Chhathwin, Hamirpur	-do-
3.	One	Shri Beli Ram s/o Shri Tota Ram	Sasotha, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Rabi 1966)
4.	One	Smt. Prabhi Devi wd/o Shri Beli Ram	Barrota, Hamirpur	-do-
5.	One	Shri Gulaba Ram s/o Shri Sihi.	Kakrot, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1965)
6.	One	Shri Shiv Ram s/o Charatu Ram.	Bart, Hamirpur	-do-
7.	Three	Shri Lashkari Ram s/o Shri Hira Lal	Tikkar, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Kharif 1964)
8.	Three	Smt. Rasilu Devi wd/o Shri Nika Ram	Chabutra, Hamirpur	Rs. 100 (Rabi 1968)

S. N. BISARYA,
Under Secretary.

Simla-2, the 3rd October, 1969

No. 4-12/68-Rev. II.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh that land is likely to be required to be taken by the Himachal Pradesh Government at the public expense for a public purpose namely for the construction of Seismological Observatory at Simla in Village Bharari, Tehsil Simla, District Simla. It is hereby notified that land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the above purpose.

This Notification is made under the provision of section 4 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other Acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to the acquisition of the said land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this Notification file an objection in writing before the Collector, Simla district, Simla (Himachal Pradesh).

SPECIFICATION

District: SIMLA		Tehsil: SIMLA	
Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis. Bisw.	
BHARARI	31	1	6 0
Total ..		1	6 0

By order,
U. N. SHARMA,
Secretary.

Simla-2, the 6th October, 1969

No. 4-48/68-Rev. II.—Whereas it appears to the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh that the land is required to be taken by the Government at public expense for a public purpose, namely for the construction of New Control Point in village Sundernagar, Tehsil Sundernagar, District Mandi (Himachal Pradesh), it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

2. The declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Beas Sutlej Link Project, Mandi (Himachal Pradesh), is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the land may be inspected in the office of the Land Acquisition Collector, Beas Sutlej Link Project, Mandi (Himachal Pradesh).

SPECIFICATION

District: MANDI		Tehsil: SUNDERNAGAR	
Village	Khasra No.	Area Big. Bis. Bisw.	
SUNDERNAGAR	90/1	0	2 0
Total ..		0	2 0

By order,
H. R. MAHAJAN,
Secretary.

Simla-2, the 7th October, 1969

No. 2-12/64-Rev. I.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 3(c) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Act No. I of 1894) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri Hari Singh, District Development and Panchayat Officer, Kulu district, as Land Acquisition Officer, Mandi and Kulu districts, to perform the functions and exercise the powers of Collector under the said Act in respect of Acquisition of land for the purposes of Public Works Department only within the jurisdiction of Mandi and Kulu districts, from the date of taking over the charge of the post.

Simla-2, the 7th October, 1969

No. 2-12-64-Rev. I.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 3(c) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Act No. I of 1894) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri S. S. Negi, Compensation Officer, Chamba district, as Land Acquisition Officer, Chamba district, to perform the functions and exercise the powers of Collector under the said Act in respect of Acquisition of land for the purposes of Public Works Department within the jurisdiction of Chamba district only, from the date of taking over the charge of the post.

2. The powers of Land Acquisition Collector conferred upon for the said purposes upon Shri Sohan Lal, formerly Compensation Officer, Chamba district vide this Department Notification of even number dated the 12th June, 1968, are hereby withdrawn from the date of taking over charge of the post by Shri S. S. Negi.

By order,
S. N. BISARYA,
Under Secretary.

Simla-2, the 7th October, 1969

No. 1-15/69-Rev. I.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 2(a) of the Punjab New Mandi Townships (Development and Regulation) Act, 1960, as in force in the territories transferred to Himachal Pradesh with effect from 1-11-1966 as a result of Re-organisation of State of Punjab and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri Lal Singh, Special Officer (Colonization), Himachal Pradesh as 'Administrator' for performing the functions of 'Administrator' under this Act, from the date of his taking over charge of the post.

By order,
U. N. SHARMA,
Secretary.

Simla-2, the 8th October, 19 9

No. 6/67-Rev. I.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 (1-A)/3(1)(a)/3(1)(b)(i) of the East Punjab War Awards Act, 1948, read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification No. S.O. 3370, dated the 1st November, 1966, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make a grant of War Jagirs of the annual value of Rs. 100.00 each (Rupees one hundred) only in favour of the undermentioned persons as award for war services rendered by their respective son/sons subject to such

conditions as to its enjoyment as are contained in their respective Sanads of the Jagir granted to them in this behalf:—

Serial No.	No. of sons in Armed Forces	Name/parentage of the grantee	Particulars about residence	Annual amount of War Jagir effective Rabi/Kharif
			Village/Tehsil of District Kangra	
1.	One	Shmt. Kimtu Devi wd/o Shri Barru Ram.	Chhurn, Palampur.	Rs. 100 (Kharif, 1965).
2.	Three	Shri Basheshwar Ram s/o Shri Fithu.	Bheth, Palampur.	Rs 100 Rabi, 1966).

S. N. BISARYA,
Under Secretary.

TOURISM DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATION

Simla-4, the 8th October, 1969

No. 11-58/67-TD.—In supersession of this Department's Notification of even No. dated the 4th October, 1967, the Lieutenant Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to reconstitute Dussehra Committee, Kulu to organise the Kulu Dussehra Festival in a befitting manner and to appoint the following members thereof:—

The Deputy Commissioner, Kulu .. Chairman

Official Members

1. The Conservator of Forests, Kulu .. Member
2. The Superintending Engineer, H.P. P.W.D., Kulu .. Member
3. The Executive Engineer, H.P. P.W.D., Kulu .. Member
4. The Divisional Forest Officer, Kulu .. Member
5. The General Assistant to D.C. Kulu .. Member
6. The District Education Officer, Kulu .. Member
7. The Block Development and Panchayat Officer Kulu .. Member
8. The District Public Relations Officer, Kulu .. Member

9. The Tourist Officer, Tourist Information Bureau, Kulu .. Member Secretary.

Non-Official Members

1. Shri Devi Singh, M.L.A. .. Member
 2. Shri Dile Ram Shabab, M.L.A. .. Member
 3. Shri Ishar Dass, M.L.A. .. Member
 4. Raja Mohinder Singh, Rupie Palace, Kulu .. Member
 5. The Chairman Block Samiti, Kulu .. Member
 6. The President Municipal Committee, Kulu .. Member
 7. The Chairman Zila Parishad, Kulu .. Member
 8. Shri Jalpu Ram, Sarpanch Jagatsukhi and Member Block Samiti Nagar .. Member
 9. Major Bhup Singh Chauhan, Sultanpur, Kulu .. Member
 10. The General Manager, Mandi-Kulu Road Transport Corporation, Mandi .. Member
2. The term of non-official members will be two years.
3. The non-official members are appointed in their official capacity and non-officials in their personal capacity.
4. No travelling allowance or daily allowance will be given to any member.

PREM RAJ MAHAJAN,
Secretary.

VIDHAN SABHA SECRETARIAT NOTIFICATION

Simla-4, the 9th October, 1969

No. 1-22/69-VS.—The following order by the Administrator dated the 29th September, 1969, is published for general information.
“In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 6 of the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 (No. 20 of 1963), I, Lieutenant General K. Bahadur Singh, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor) of Himachal Pradesh, hereby prorogue the Legislative Assembly of the Union Territory of Himachal Pradesh.

BAHADUR SINGH,
Lieutenant General (Retd.),
Administrator.”

D. B. LAL,
Secretary.

भाग २—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS

Simla-5, the 5th January, 1968

No. 13-3/65-Agr. III.—In exercise of the powers vested in me vide Rule 10(4) of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1959, read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs letter No. 1/5/63-Finance (Pt.), dated the 1st May, 1964, I hereby declare the Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, Kulu District, Kulu (H.P.), as Head of Office and Drawing and Disbursing Officer and the Deputy Director of Agriculture (Soil Conservation) Simla-5, as Controlling Officer in respect of “31-Agriculture-Plan and Non-Plan (i) F-13(2) Soil Conservation in River Valley Project (ii) Q-Loans and advances by State and Union Territories Government A-Loans to Local Funds Private Parties etc. A-3 Loans to Cultivators under Centrally Sponsored Scheme Soil Conservation in River Valley Project” for the staff posted under them in this Scheme.

This notification will take effect from the date of issue.

Simla-5, the 5th January, 1968

No. 13-3/65-Agr. III.—In exercise of the powers vested in me vide Rule 10(4) of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1959, read with the Government of India Ministry of Home Affairs, letter No. 1/5/63-Finance (Pt.), dated the 1st May, 1964, I hereby declare the District Agricultural Officer, Kulu (H.P.), as Head of Office and Drawing and Disbursing officer and the Deputy Director of Agriculture (Ext.) H.P. Simla-5 as Controlling Officer

in respect of 31-Agriculture-Plan and Non-Plan (i) D-5 Improvement of Rice (ii) F-9 Development of Oil seeds for the staff posted under them in these schemes.

This notification will take effect from the date of issue.

Sd/-
Director of Agricultural.

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, CHAMBA DISTRICT, CHAMBA OFFICE ORDER

Chamba, the 27th September, 1969

No. Pnt.CH.14(4)/68-7939.—In pursuance of Rule 102 of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayat Raj Rules, I, District Magistrate, Chamba district, Chamba hereby send the requisition to Tehsildar Bhattiyat of Chamba district to arrange for selection of 15 adults by the Gram Sabha of each Circle to serve as Panches of the Nyaya Panchayats of following Gram Sabha Circle within a month.

The Tehsildar Bhattiyat who shall act as Returning Officer is directed to send a copy of programme chalked out by him under Rule 103 of Himachal Pradesh Panchayat Raj Rules and also send to the undersigned the report of selection in the manner laid down in Rule 106 of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayat Rules.

NYAYA PANCHAYATS

Serial No.	Panchayat Circle	Serial No.	Panchayat Circle
1.	Chowari	9.	Chuhan
2.	Parchore	10.	Bathri
3.	Manhuta	11.	Mail
4.	Jandrogo	12.	Manola
5.	Gola	13.	Gadana
6.	Dulahara	14.	Tundi
7.	Malunda	15.	Kathet
8.	Banet		

Sd/-
District Magistrate.

भाग ३—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के उप-राज्यपाल, हिमाचल बेंच आफ़ देहली हाई कोर्ट, फाइनेंशियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ़ इन्कम-टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि

**EXCISE AND TAXATION DEPARTMENT
NOTIFICATION**

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 1-8/66-E&T.—Consequent upon the grant of earned leave to Shri R. D. Chauhan, Excise and Taxation Officer, Mandi, who was ordered to hold additional charge of Bilaspur district, I, in exercise of the powers vested in me under Rule 10A of the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1958, hereby declare Shri D. C. Dwivedi, Assistant Excise and Taxation Officer, Mandi as Head of Office and Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of Class III and IV employees of the Excise and Taxation Department, Himachal Pradesh posted in Mandi and Bilaspur districts under the following heads of accounts with immediate effect till Shri R. D. Chauhan resumes his duties:—

- (i) "10-STATE EXCISE DUTIES".
B-District Executive Establishment.
- (ii) "13-OTHER TAXES AND DUTIES".
A—Collection Charges.
A-2—Superintendence.
- (iii) "12-SALES TAX".
A—Collection Charges.

The aforesaid officer will also function as Controlling Officer in respect of T.A. and D.A. of Class III and IV employees.

By order,

B. C. NEGI,

Excise and Taxation Commissioner.

**OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX
PUNJAB, HARYANA, JAMMU AND KASHMIR
HIMACHAL PRADESH AND CHANDIGARH**

NOTIFICATION

Patiala-1, the 27th January, 1968

No. K-1(12)Admn/67-68/906.—Under sub-section (1) of section

the Income-tax Act, 1961, the following additions and amendments are made in the Schedule appended to the notification No. K-1(II)Admn/67/519, dated 13-9-1967:—

1. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Jammu.
Delete—5. Mandi Circle.
2. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Patiala.
Insert—7. Mandi Circle.

This will have effect from 1st February, 1968.

S. R. MEHTA,
Commissioner of Income-tax.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Simla-E. the 25th September, 1969

No. R. 25-298/59-II.—In exercise of the powers delegated by the President under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution vide Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs' Notification No. 27/59-Him.(i), dated the 18th July, 1959, the Administrator (Lieutenant Governor), Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following amendment in the Himachal Pradesh District Subordinate Service (Class III) Rules, 1962, issued vide Revenue Department's Notification No. R.25-298/59, dated the 5th April, 1962, as amended from time to time:—

AMENDMENT

In the said Rules:

For the words "Financial Commissioner", wherever they occur, the words and brackets "Commissioner (Revenue)" shall be substituted.

By order,

U. N. SHARMA,
Financial Commissioner.

भाग ४—स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन: म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाउन एरिया तथा पंचायत विभाग

शून्य

भाग ५—व्यक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

STATE BANK OF PATIALA

NOTICE

Patiala, the 1st October, 1969/9th Ashvina, 1891 (Saka)

No. S.B-P. 94.—The under-noted transfers and changes in the posting of Bank's staff are hereby notified:—

1. Shri D. D. Sharma, Junior Officer officiated as Manager,

Solan branch on 29th August, 1969 *vice* Shri P. S. Suri, Officer Grade 'C'.

2. Shri Trilok Nath, Junior Officer held charge of Nurpur branch as from the commencement of business on 12th September, 1969 to the commencement of business on 17th September, 1969.

K. SUBRAMANIAN,
General Manager.

भाग ६—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में संपुनः प्रकाशन

LAW DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Simla-2, the 30th September, 1969

No. 13-12/69-LR.—The Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 1969 (25 of 1969) recently passed by the Parliament which has already been published in the Gazette of India, is hereby republished in the Himachal Pradesh Government Rajpatra for the information of general public.

JOSEPH DINA NATH,
Under Secretary (Judicial).

**THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1969**

**AN
ACT**

further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Twentieth Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) This Act may be called the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 1969.

(2) This section and section 2 shall be deemed to have come into force on the 16th day of May, 1969 and the other provisions of this Act shall come into force at once.

2. *Amendment of section 3.*—In the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 (30 of 1954), (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in section 3, for the words "thirty-one rupees", the words "fifty-one rupees" shall be substituted.

3. *Amendment of section 5.*—In section 5 of the principal Act, for the second proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided further that nothing in the first proviso shall apply, if the member performs the journey by air for visiting any place in India—

- (a) not more than four times during a session lasting more than seventy-five days;
- (b) not more than twice during a session lasting for seventy-five days or less; and
- (c) not more than once during a sitting of the committee.”

4. *Amendment of section 6.*—In section 6 of the principal Act, in the *Explanation* to sub-section (1), for the words “For the purposes of this sub-section”, the words, figure and letter “For the purposes of this sub-section and section 6A” shall be substituted.

5. *Insertion of new section 6A.*—After section 6 of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely:—

“6A. *Travel facilities to members.*—Without prejudice to the other provisions of this Act, every member shall be entitled—

- (i) to travel by any railway in India at any time in first class air-conditioned on payment of the difference between the railway fares for first class air-conditioned and first class;
- (ii) to one free third class railway pass for one person to accompany the member when he travels by rail; and
- (iii) to one free non-transferable first class railway pass for the spouse, if any, of the member to travel from the usual place of residence of the member to Delhi and back, once during every session:

Provided that where a member travels by rail in first class air conditioned and no person accompanies that member in that journey in third class, by virtue of the free third class railway pass referred to in clause (ii), then, in determining the amount payable by the member under clause (i), the amount of third class fare for such journey shall be deducted from the difference referred to in that clause.”

भाग ७—भारतीय निर्वाचन प्रायोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

ELECTION DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATION

Simla-2, the 24th September, 1969

No. 3-10/68-Elec.—The following notification of the Election Commission of India, dated the 6th April, 1968, is hereby published for general information.

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA NOTIFICATION

Talkatora Road, New Delhi-1, 6th April, 1968/Chaitra 17, 1890 (Saka)

No. 82/11 of 1967/HP/67.—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order, pronounced on the 16th January, 1968, by the High Court of Delhi, Himachal Bench, Simla in Election Petition No. 11 of 1967.

By order,
A. N. SEN,

Secretary to the Election Commission.

H.C.J.D./A-35.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI HIMACHAL BENCH AT SIMLA

C.O.P.No. 11 of 1967 from Original Decree
Revision Application No. Appellante order

Date of decision 16-1-68

Basant Ram through Mr. M. R. Gupta, Advocate
Versus

Nalu Ram through Mr. Chhabil Dass, Advocate

For approval and signature

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.N. Andley.

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment?

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? Yes.

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? Coram:—

S. N. Andley J.

The respondent was declared elected to the Himachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly from the No. 2 Rampur (Reserved) constituency and his election has been challenged by this petition which was filed on or

about April 8, 1967 in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner at Simla and has come to be dealt with by this Court as a result of the reorganisation of Himachal Pradesh and the extension of the jurisdiction of this Court thereto.

The requisite notification was issued by the competent authority on January 18, 1967. Nomination papers were filed by the petitioner; the respondent and one Shri Saran Alias Saran Dass before the Returning Officer at Kasumpti. The respondent filed his nomination paper on January 16, 1967. Polling in the entire constituency took place on 18th and 21st February, 1967. The result of the election was declared on February 25, 1967. The result of polling reflected by the following result:—

Nalu Ram (respondent) secured	5423 votes;
Basant Ram (petitioner) secured	4482 votes;
Shri Saran secured	137 votes;
Invalid votes were	949.

The petition challenged the election of the respondent on various grounds. Two of the grounds were that the arrangement of lighting in most of the polling booths was defective and a great number of votes cast in favour of the petitioner were wrongly rejected as invalid and a great number of votes, which were invalid, cast in favour of the respondent were declared to be valid. These two allegations from the subject matter of Issues Nos. 8 and 9 which are as follows:

“Issue No. 8.—Whether the lighting arrangements in most of the polling booths in the constituency were defective and whether as a result of such defect a large number of ballot papers were either found black or could not be affixed with proper marks by the voters as alleged in para 4 of the petition and if so whether this has materially effected the result of the election”.

“Issue No. 9.—Whether any of the votes for the petitioner were wrongly held to be invalid by the Returning Officer and whether a large number of votes cast in favour of the respondent were wrongly accepted as valid as alleged in para 6 of the petition. If so, its effect.

These two Issues were not pressed at the time of arguments because no application had been made by the petitioner for inspection of the votes illegally accepted or rejected and it was conceded that there was hardly any evidence in support of the allegation of defective light.

Issue No. 1 is in the following terms:—

“Whether the respondent has kept separate and correct accounts of election expenses and if so what is its effect?”.

The allegations with respect to this issue are contained in paragraph 6 of the petition which is as follows:—

“That as required by section 77 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and Rules of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961, the respondent did not keep a separate and correct account of all the expenditure day to day in connection with the election incurred or authorised by him between the date of the publication of the Notification calling the election that is 13th January, 1967, and the date of the declaration of the result thereof, namely, 25th February, 1967. The copy of the account lodged by the respondent with the Returning Officer is not a true copy of the account, if at all, any was kept by the respondent”.

The respondent denied these allegations and replied to them in paragraph 6 of the written statement in the following words:—

“Para 6 is wrong and is denied. Proper accounts of expenditure were maintained by the respondent as envisaged under the law. The return filed by the petitioner is correct and according to law”.

Paragraph 6 of the replication is merely a reiteration of the allegations made in paragraph 6 of the petition and a denial of the allegations made in paragraph 6 of the written statement.

The requirement of keeping account is contained in section 77 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 hereinafter referred to as “the Act”, and this section is in these terms:—

“(1) Every candidate at an election shall, either by himself or by his election agent, keep a separate and correct account of all expenditure in connection with the election incurred or authorized by him or by his election agent between the date of publication of the notification calling the election and date of declaration of the result thereof, both dates inclusive.

(2) The account shall contain such particulars, as may be prescribed.

(3) The total of the said expenditure shall not exceed such amount as may be prescribed”.

The particulars required to be given in the account are prescribed by rule 86, which is not mentioned in the petition, of the Conduct of Elections Rules, 1961. Rule 86 of these Rules provides:—

(1) The account of election expenses to be kept by a candidate or his election agent under section 77 shall contain the following particulars in respect OF EACH ITEM OF EXPENDITURE FROM DAY TO DAY;

Namely:—

- (a) the date on which the expenditure was incurred or authorised;
- (b) the nature of the expenditure (as for example, travelling, postage or printing and the like);
- (c) the amount of the expenditure—
 - (i) the amount paid;
 - (ii) the amount outstanding;
- (d) the date of payment;
- (e) the name and address of the payee;
- (f) the serial number of vouchers, in case of amount paid;
- (g) the serial number of bills if any, in case of amount outstanding;
- (h) the name and address of the person to whom the amount outstanding is payable.

(2) A voucher shall be obtained for every item of expenditure

unless from the nature of the case such as postage, travel by rail and the like, it is not practicable to obtain voucher.

(3) All vouchers shall be lodged along with the account of election expenses, arranged according to the date of payment and serially numbered by the candidate or his election agent and such serial numbers shall be entered in the account under item (f) of sub-rule (1).

(4) It shall not be necessary to give the particulars mentioned in item (e) of sub-rule (1) in regard to items of expenditure for which vouchers have not been obtained under sub-rule (2).

No accounts were produced by the respondent until the conclusion of the evidence in this case on September 27, 1967 when, just before the conclusion of his cross-examination the respondent stated:—

“I have entered the expenses pertaining to this election in a copy-book which I maintained. I have brought that copy-book. The statement of my election expenses is in this copy-book marked Ex. R-1. I have not maintained any other account of expenses. It is incorrect that this statement was prepared in one day”.

This copy-book is like the ordinary copy-book which is used by students. The first three pages of it contain the names of various polling stations and the votes secured by the parties hereto and by Saran Dass at various polling station. The next three pages of this copy-book are blank and the accounts so called are contained on the next page.

The suggestion which was made in the cross-examination of the respondent was that the entries regarding expenditure in this copy-book had been made on one day. The various entries, which altogether total ten, are not in the same ink and it is possible that these entries were not made on the same day. These entries contain the date; the head of expenditure and the amount of expenditure. At the same time, on looking at these accounts, it is not possible to say that they were maintained in regular course. Even all the particulars which are required by clauses (e) to (h) of rule 86 of the said Rules have not been given. In my opinion, these accounts are not the sort of accounts which are contemplated by section 77 of the Act read with rule 86 of the said Rules.

But the mere non-maintenance of the accounts as required by the said section and as prescribed by the said Rules does not have any effect in so far as the election is concerned and that is my answer to Issue No. 1.

Issue No. 2 relates to the corrupt practice contemplated by sub-section (6) of section 123 of the Act and is in these terms:—

“Whether the respondent has committed the corrupt practice of incurring or authorizing the incurring of expenses more than Rs. 2,000 as detailed in para 8 of the election petition.”.

It may here be mentioned that the total amount of expenditure returned by the respondent by the Return of Expenses (Exhibit PW. 1/1-A) is Rs. 439.25 whereas the limit prescribed for Himachal Pradesh under section 77

of the Act is Rs. 2,000. The case of the petitioner is that the respondent has not included in his Return of Expenses various amounts which are mentioned in paragraph 8 of the petition. The petitioner says:—

“That in fact the respondent incurred himself and authorised the incurring of expenditure totalling to more than Rs. 6,000 in connection with his election, which he has not mentioned in the return. Some of the items of expenditure not shown are as follows”, and then follow 12 items of alleged expenses incurred by the respondent and not shown in the Return of Expenses. In paragraph 8 of the written statement, the respondent has denied incurring any expenses beyond what has been shown in his Return.

The first item is an item of Rs. 50 with regard to this item, the petitioner says in paragraph 8(1) of the petition:—

“After the Notification of 13-1-1967, the respondent came to Simla, stayed for some days and returned to Rampur with nomination papers which he got filled and signed by his proposers before 16-1-1967. One of his proposers, Shri Shiv Saran Singh was at Sarahan at a distance of 27 miles from Rampur. The respondent has not shown the expenses incurred by him and by his proposers for aforesaid journeys, which were about Rs. 50.”

The respondent has replied to this allegation in paragraph 8 (1) of the written statement in these words:—

“Para 8(1) is denied. The expenses incurred for coming to Simla for filing nomination papers were not required by law to be shown. Shri Shiv Saran Singh did not come to Rampur at all. The nomination papers were got signed from Shri Shiv Saran Singh at Sarahan and no journey expenses were incurred.”

The second item is an item of Rs. 200 with respect to which the petitioner alleges in paragraph 8(2) of the petition as follows:—

“For filing the nomination papers, the respondent came to Simla and stayed till after the date of withdrawal, probably upto 21-1-1967. He has not shown the expenses of his journeys to and back from Simla nor the expenses of his stay at Simla, which cannot be less than Rs. 200.

The respondent has replied to this allegation in paragraph 8 (2) of the written statement in these words:—

“Para 8(2) of the petition is wrong and is denied. The respondent stayed at Simla with his friend Surti Jai Behari Lal Khachi and had not to spend anything. In any case, these were not the election expenses.”

I will deal with these two items together. I may state that the petitioner has not given any independent evidence to prove these items but the petitioner relies upon the statement made by the respondent himself in his cross-examination. This statement is as follows:—

“I had come from my village Malaila to Kasumpti in Simla to file my nomination paper. I do not remember on what date I had left my village but I filed my nomination paper on 16th January, 1967, I do not fully recollect but I may have left my village 2 or 3 days before this date. My proposers had not accompanied with me when I had come for filing my nomination paper. But they had come at the time of the scrutiny. The scrutiny was about 4 days after 16th January, 1967 or it may have been on 20th January, Dharam Sain (R.W. 5) and Shiv Saran Singh were my proposers. They did not appear before the Returning Officer on 16th January. The scrutiny officer did not make any enquiries from me about the whereabouts of my proposers. The pro-

posers did not meet me between 16th January and 20th January. They had come to Simla but I do not know when. I did not know that my nomination paper will not be taken on the record unless my proposers were present at the time of filing it. The returning officer had compared the names and description with the relative entry in the electoral roll. The proposers were not present when the comparison was made. I do not remember the names of other persons who were present when I filed my nomination paper. They did not meet me after they had appeared at the time of the scrutiny to the nomination paper. Dharam Sain (R.W. 5) had signed the nomination paper in Rampur where I had gone from my village. My village is 24 miles from Rampur. I had gone from my village to Sarahan to obtain the signatures of other proposer Shiv Saran Singh, Sarahan is another 24 miles beyond Rampur. I had gone to Rampur and Sarahan from my village on foot after consulting the people of the villages on the way. I also returned from Sarahan and Rampur back to my village on foot, via Kinnu, Mashru, Dhar Gaura; etc. I do not remember the date on which I reached Rampur. I maintained a diary where this information will be available. I used to note in my diary the areas which I visited and the dates on which I visited my area. I have that diary at my house. Rampur and Sarahan are on the bus route. If I wanted to go to Rampur by bus I left my village by Bhaira Khud. This place is 5/6 miles from my village. I do not remember the date on which I left my village to get the signatures of the proposers nor do I remember the date I returned to my village. So far as I recollect, I left my village for Rampur and Sarahan 6/7 days before I filed my nomination paper. I did not spend any amount during these days. I had come to Simla to file my nomination paper along with my friend Hardyal Singh in his jeep. I have not mentioned the facts relating to Hardyal Singh as deposed by me today in para 8 of my written statement because I thought it was not necessary to write that. It is incorrect that I went from my village to Rampur and thence to Sarahan and came to Simla by bus and that I had not deliberately shown the bus fare in my return of expenses. From Simla I went upto Narkanda in the jeep which was with Jai Bihari Lal Khachi and from Narkanda I went to my village on foot. I cannot give the date on which I left Simla from my village. I did not think it was necessary to mention the fact relating to Jai Behari Lal Khachi deposed by me now in para 8 of my written statement. I stayed in Simla after filing my nomination paper upto the date of scrutiny and left Simla on the day following scrutiny. During my stay in Simla I was staying with Jai Behari Lal Khachi. It is incorrect that I spent Rs. 250 in connection with the filing of my nomination paper and scrutiny. I did not spend anything because I was being fed by my friends”.

The contention of the respondent in paragraph 8(1) of the written statement was that the expenses incurred for coming to Simla for filing the nomination paper were not required by law to be shown. It was a legal contention and proceeded on the footing that expenses for coming to Simla for filing nomination paper were incurred by the respondent. The legal contention cannot be accepted because the date for filing of nomination papers falls within the two dates specified in section 77 of the Act. But then the question is what was the amount of expenses incurred? The petitioner has, as stated, only estimated such expenses and has not proved by any evidence at all as to what expenses actually were incurred by the respondent. It was

easy for the petitioner to prove these expenses by proving that the respondent had gone to Simla by Bus or by some other vehicle and had paid the fare by producing the owners of such vehicles. The allegation of taking Shiv Saran Singh, one of the proposers, from Sarahan to Simla is denied by the respondent in his written statement and this allegation also has not been proved by the petitioner by any evidence and I cannot accept the claim of the petitioner in view of the categorical denial by the respondent in his statement in court of the allegation that his proposer had accompanied him when he went to Simla for filing his nomination paper. In the absence of any evidence of the actual amount incurred by the respondent, I reject the petitioner's claim for including Rs. 50 as claimed in paragraph 8(1) of the petition. With regard to the second item of Rs. 200 which is the subject matter of the allegations in paragraph 8(2) of the petition, the respondent's case in the written statement as well as in his evidence is that the respondent had stayed at Simla with his friend Jai Behair Lal Khachi. There is no evidence from the side of the petitioner to controvert this statement of the respondent. I, therefore, reject the claim of the petitioner in respect of this item of Rs. 200 also.

The third item of alleged expenses is an amount of Rs. 125 in respect of which the allegation in paragraph 8 (3) of the petition is that the respondent deposited this amount on January 16, 1967 with his nomination paper as security. It is not necessary to deal with this item at any length because this item was given up by the counsel for the petitioner at the time of arguments.

The next item of expense which is not specified is the subject matter of the allegation in paragraph 8(4) of the petition, where it is stated:—

“He had rented an office in Negi Gopi Nand's building a Rampur; the rent and other expenses were not shown.”

The respondent has replied to this allegation in paragraph 8 (4) of the written statement as under:—

“In reply to para 8(4) of the petition it is submitted that no rent was paid to Shri Gopi Nand”.

Upon the pleadings, the respondent has admitted that he had taken premises in the house of Negi Gopi Nand at Rampur as and for his election office, but the case is that such premises were taken for free and no rent was paid therefor.

Chet Ram (PW. 19) states that he has not been able to find whether that office had been taken for free or on rent. Dharam Sain (R.W. 5), a supporter of the respondent, denies that any rent was paid for this office by him or by the respondent. The owner of this building is Gopi Nand (R.W. 2). He has stated that one of the rooms in his house was unoccupied and he gave this room to the respondent for election purposes without charging any rent. His testimony has not been shaken in cross-examination and the testimony of the petitioner (PW. 22) that the respondent had taken these premises at a rent of Rs. 100 per month cannot be accepted.

I, therefore, rejected the petitioner's claim that the respondent had paid Rs. 100 or any other amount by way of rent for his election office in the building of Negi Gopi Nand (R.W. 2) at Rampur.

The next item of expense is a sum of Rs. 1,250 which is alleged to have been paid by the respondent to some of his workers. The allegations in this behalf are contained in paragraph 8(5) of the petition which is as follows:—

“The respondent has engaged the services of workers namely Sarvshri Ghinoo Ram, Maya Ram, Jheroo, Ram, Gokal Ram, Khamani Ram, Jaggi Ram, Haria Ram, Lachhmi Dass, Bhajan Dass, Karam

Dass, Negi Beli Ram, Sant Ram, Tej Ram and Punnu, etc. He has not shown the cash payments made to them nor has to shown their salaries, wages, travelling expenses and diet expenses incurred by them and other persons. The amount of such expenses and payments exceeded Rs. 1,250”.

The reply of the respondent is contained in paragraph 8(5) of the written statement and is in these terms:—

“In reply to para 8(5) of the petition it is submitted that Shri Ghinu Ram was the supporter of the respondent who did canvass for him, but no remuneration by way of salary, wages, travelling expenses and diet expenses were incurred for him by the respondent. Sarvshri Maya Ram, Bhajan Dass and Khamani Ram are not known to the respondent. Sarvshri Jheru Ram, Gokal, Jaggi Ram, Haria Ram, Lachhmi Dass, Karam Dass, Negi Beli Ram, Sant Ram, Tej Ram and Punnu were the workers of the petitioner himself and were his active supporters.”

The reply of the petitioner contained in paragraph 8(5) of the replication is as follows:—

“Sub-para 5 of para 8 of the written statement has been wrongly stated by the respondent. Averments in the corresponding sub-para of the petition are correct and are reiterated. It is categorically denied that Sarvshri Jheru Ram, Gokal, Jaggi Ram, Haria Ram, Lachhmi Dass, Karam Dass, Negi Beli Ram, Sant Ram, Tej Ram and Punnu Ram or any one or more of them were the workers or supporters of the petitioner. In fact, the services of all these persons, including the services of the other persons mentioned in the corresponding sub-para of the petition, had been engaged by the respondent on payment; and in fact the expenses and payments by the respondent for the salaries, wages, travelling expenses and diet expenses were incurred by the respondent the amount of which exceeded Rs. 1,250.”

It will be noticed that the petitioner has not mentioned the amounts which are alleged to have been paid individually to the various persons mentioned in paragraph 8(5) of the petition.

I am mention that out of the various persons mentioned in paragraph 8(5) of the petition, there is no evidence whatsoever of any payment having been made to Ghinoo Ram; Maya Ram; Jheru Ram; Gokal Ram; Khamani Ram; Negi Beli Ram; Tej Ram and Punnu. Evidence has, however, been given about payments having been made to some of the other persons whose names and the amounts paid to them are given below:—

Karam Dass (PW. 4)	Rs. 250
Sant Lal (PW. 18)	Rs. 250
Haria Ram (PW. 10)	Rs. 100
Bhajan Dass (PW. 11)	Rs. 100
Jaggi Ram (PW. 14)	Rs. 100
Sialu Ram (PW. 15).	Rs. 300.

It may be mentioned that the name of Sialu Ram (PW. 15) is not mentioned in paragraph 8(5) of the petition. I am therefore, not prepared to consider the argument or the evidence in that behalf that Rs. 300 were paid to him by the respondent. As to the other persons mentioned above, the case of the respondent is that they were not the workers of the respondent but of the petitioner himself.

Karam Dass (PW. 4) is the Vice-President of the Gram Panchayat, Delaht. He states that he was an active worker of the respondent and that he had received a letter from the respondent asking the witness to work of the respondent. This letter is dated December 23, 1966 that is long

before the actual polling. It contains a criticism of the Congress and of the candidates sponsored by it who are described as mere "Yes men". It mentions the necessity of electing persons who will awaken the public. It informs the witness that the respondent proposes to seek election. The sending of this letter is not disputed by the respondent. In fact, the respondent has stated in his evidence that this was one of the series of letters written by him to Presidents of various Panchayats in the Constituency before filing his nomination paper and asking for help in the elections. The respondent states that this witness was not working for him but was working for the petitioner. This witness in his own statement in Court says that the respondent had come to see him in the village of the witness and had seen him. Yet, he alleges that he received a sum of Rs. 250 from Sant Lal (PW. 18) who had told him that the respondent had asked him to do so. This witness further states that he had received a letter (Exhibit PW. 4/2) from Sant Lal (PW. 18). Now, the letter (Exhibit PW. 4/2) is dated February 10, 1967, that is, shortly before the polling. It purports to have been sent from Theog, whereas the village of Sant Lal (PW. 18) is Tharu. It states that the respondent is a candidate of the Lok Raj Samiti from Rampur Reserved constituency and Jai Behari Lal Khachi is a candidate from Theog constituency that he is working in Theog constituency on behalf of Jai Behari Lal Khachi; that Karam Dass (PW. 4) should work for the respondent a candidate of the Lok Raj Samiti on whose behalf a sum of Rs. 250 was being sent for him and the voters; that this amount had been paid by the Lok Raj Samiti which will be paid over on February 13, 1967, when this witness comes to the village of Karam Dass (P.W. 4) and when he will talk about the talk that he had with the respondent and that the Lok Raj Samiti had lot of funds and were giving various amounts to workers and voters. While the letter states that the amount of Rs. 250 had been paid to Sant Lal (PW. 18) by the Lok Raj Samiti, a different story is told by Sant Lal (PW. 18) when he comes to give his evidence in Court. In his statement in Court, this witness says that it was the respondent who had paid him Rs. 500 in Simla in February, 1967, out of which Rs. 250 were to be paid to Karam Dass (PW. 4) and Rs. 250 were left with him to meet journey expenses for going to the area.

Evidence of Sant Lal (PW. 18) in Court is clearly contradictory to the statement made in his letter (Exhibit P.W. 4/2). It is a curious fact in this case that many of the witnesses produced by the petitioner including Karam Dass (PW. 4) and Sant Lal (PW. 18) have stated that they were the workers of the respondent. Yet, they have come forward as witnesses for the petitioner. In the face of the denial of the respondent that Karam Dass (PW. 4) and Sant Lal (P.W. 18) were not his workers but were the workers of the petitioner himself, I am not going to place any reliance either on the testimony of Karam Dass (PW. 4) or on the testimony of Sant Lal (PW. 18) particularly when this letter, alongwith two other letters to which I will advert a little later, were produced by the petitioner and not by Karam Dass (PW. 4). If Karam Dass (PW. 4) had really been a worker of the respondent, I do not know why he should have parted with such a letter and given it over to the petitioner against whom, according to his own story, he was working. It may also be noticed that although Sant Lal (PW. 18) is alleged to be the writer of this letter (Ex. PW. 4/2) he has not said a word about having written it in his own statement in Court. My finding, therefore, is that Karam Dass (PW. 4) and Sant Lal (PW. 18) are not witnesses of truth and that the letter dated February 10, 1967 (Ex. PW. 4/2) has been subsequently produced for the purposes of this case. I, therefore, reject the petitioner's case that any

amounts were paid by the respondent to Karam Dass (PW. 4) or to Sant Lal (PW. 18) as alleged.

The next payment is a payment of Rs. 100 alleged to have been made by the respondent to Haria Ram (PW. 10) and this payment is alleged to have been made to his witness on behalf of the respondent by Budhi Ram (PW. 9). Budhi Ram (PW. 9) has stated that he was working for the respondent. This witness, as has been noted by me on the record, has not impressed me. His answers were given after considerable delay and after looking at the letters which are alleged to have been written by him. The letters written by this witness are dated February 9, 1967 (Ex. P. 2); February 10, 1967 (Ex. P. 3) and February 12, 1967 (Ex. P. 4). These three letters are written on or about the same date as was the letter (Exhibit PW. 4/2) alleged to have been written by Sant Lal (P.W. 18) to Karam Dass (PW. 4). These letters purported to have been written by Budhi Ram (PW. 9) as an accredited representative of the Lok Raj Samiti of which Thakur Sen Negi (PW. 3), who retired as the Chief Secretary in the Himachal Pradesh Government, and Lal Chand Stokes (RW. 4) a substantial farmer of Himachal Pradesh were two of the leading lights. No question has been put to Thakur Sen Negi (RW. 3) about his having even known Budhi Ram (PW. 9) much less known him as an accredited representative of even a worker of the Lok Raj Samiti. Nor have any question been put to him as to whether the Lok Raj Samiti had authorised the spending of any amounts in connection with the election of the respondent or of other candidates sponsored by it. Letter (Ex. P. 3) mentions that the money shall be obtained either from Dharam Sain (RW. 5) or from Bansi Lal Vakil (RW. 9) who were admittedly supporting the respondent, who was alleged to be a candidate sponsored by the Lok Raj Samiti. But, Lal Chand Stokes (RW. 4) who was the treasurer of the Lok Raj Samiti has categorically stated that no funds were provided by the Lok Raj Samiti within the knowledge of this witness or through him to Dharam Sain (RW. 5) or to Bansi Lal (RW. 9) or to the respondent for the election. No question has been put to this witness also as to whether Budhi Ram (PW. 9) was known to him either as an accredited representative and supporter of the Lok Raj Samiti or otherwise. These three letter also talk about the Lok Raj Samiti having plenty of funds to be spent for the elections. Such statements in these letters would be utterly irresponsible and dangerous statements coming from a professed accredited representative of the Lok Raj Samiti. In my opinion, the statement of Budhi Ram (PW. 9) is a false statement and the story that he paid a sum of Rs. 100 to Haria Ram (PW. 10) is not believable. I may also mention that Budhi Ram (PW. 9) is not even named in the petition as person to whom any money was paid by the respondent or by the Lok Raj Samiti even though it were for payment to Haria Ram (PW. 10). The case made out in the petition is quite different and that is that it was the respondent who had engaged the services of Haria Ram (PW. 10). If the story recited by Budhi Ram (PW. 9) is false, then inevitably the statement of Haria Ram (PW. 10) that he had been paid a sum of Rs. 100 by the respondent through Budhi Ram (PW. 9) must also fall to the ground. These letters i.e. Exhibits P.2 to P. 4 also appear to me to have been manufactured for the purposes of this case. I, therefore hold that the petitioner has produced false evidence and has not been able to prove the alleged payment of Rs. 100 by the Respondent.

The same comments would apply to the allegation that a sum of Rs. 100 was paid to Bhajan Das (PW. 11) to whom the letter dated February 10, 1967 (Ex. P. 4) is alleged to have been written by Budhi Ram (PW. 9).

The next allegation is that a sum of Rs. 100 was paid by Tej Ram (PW. 12) to Jaggi Ram (PW. 14). The evidence of these two witnesses is sought to be corroborated by another letter dated February 10, 1967 (Exhibit P. 6) alleged to have been written by Tej Ram (PW. 12) to Jaggi Ram (PW. 14). This letter again comes from the custody of the petitioner and is written on or about the same date as the other letters mentioned hereinbefore. The letter again talks of the Lok Raj Samiti having no dearth of money. It further says that Negi Bali Bahadur Singh (who has not been produced) had told the witness Tej Ram (PW. 12) that this witness was to work for the respondent and was to take Rs. 100 from the shop of Dharam Sain (RW. 5). Both Budhi Ram (PW. 9) and Tej Ram (PW. 12) allege themselves to be workers of the respondent while the respondent and his witnesses have stated that they were the worker of the petitioner. My remarks with respect to the letters Exhibit P. 2 to P. 4 and Exhibit PW. 4/2 also apply to the letter Exhibit P. 5 and I do not find it possible to place any reliance either on the testimony of Budhi Ram (PW. 9) or Tej Ram (PW. 12) or on the letter Exhibit P.5.

I, therefore, reject the petitioner's claim that a sum of Rs. 100 was paid by the respondent to Jaggi Ram (PW. 14).

The next item is a sum of Rs. 250 alleged to have been paid to Sant Lal (PW. 18). I have already discussed his evidence in connection with the allegation of payment of Rs. 250, to Karam Dass (PW. 4) and it is not necessary to add anything to that discussion except to say that this witness is not a witness of truth and the petitioner has failed to prove the payment of Rs. 250 to this witness.

The next item of expense is a sum of Rs. 300 alleged to have been paid by the respondent to Sialu Ram (P.W. 15). This witness also alleges to have worked for the respondent during the last elections. As I have stated already, the name of this witness is not mentioned in the petition as the recipient of any money and that by itself is sufficient to discard the testimony of this witness. As to this witness also, I have made a remark on the record that he is not giving straight answers and that he was entering into argument with the respondents's counsel. He has been completely shaken in cross-examination and his statement is not worthy of any reliance being placed on it. I, therefore, reject the claim of the petitioner as made out in the evidence that a sum of Rs. 300 was paid to this witness by the respondent.

The next allegation is that the respondent has not included the hire charges of two jeeps in his return of expenses. The plea giving rise to this allegation is contained in paragraph 8(6) of the petition which is as follows:—

"The respondent for his election work used two jeeps for about 15 days. He has not shown the hire charges, petrol and diesel and other oil expenses, salaries and diet of drivers. He incurred an expenses of Rs. 1,500 on this account".

The written statement contains the reply to this allegation in these words:—

"Para 8(6) of the petition is wrong and is denied apart from being vague. No jeeps were used or taken on hire by the respondent."

The petitioner improved upon the plea contained in paragraph 8 (6) of the petition by making the following allegations in paragraph 8(6) of the replication:—

"Sub-para 6 of para 8 of the written statement is wrong and that of the petition is correct and is reiterated. It is, however, further amplified that the two jeeps used by the respondent in connection with his election campaign for about 15 days were the jeeps owned by Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand and Shri Lal

Chand Stokes. The expenses of Rs. 1,500 as detailed in sub-para (6) of para 8 of the petition have not been shown by the respondent in his return of expenses. It is wrong for the respondent to state that he did not use or take on hire any jeep in connection with his election."

The allegation, therefore, was that the two jeeps belonged to Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand and Lal Chand Stokes (RW. 4) and a sum of Rs. 1,500 was spent by the respondent as hire charges, petrol and diesel and other oil expenses, salaries and diet of drivers.

The first witness is in support of this allegation is Shyama Nand (PW. 16) who has stated:

"I have been Bansi Lal, Dharam Sain, Mohan Lal, Sohan Lal, Nur-Ud-din Thekadar, Sialu, etc. who were the respondent's workers going about in a truck which looked like a wagon. Again said, like a jeep, I saw a jeep as well as a truck in which these people were going about. I saw these people coming in a truck or a jeep in villages Jeori and Dattnagar during election days. I saw the respondent also. The respondent and his son came to Rattanpur in a jeep. I never rode in the truck or the jeep either with the respondent or alone."

The next witness is Sialu Ram (PW. 15) whose evidence I have already condemned in connection with the alleged payment of Rs. 300 by the respondent to this witness. This witness has stated:—

"There were two trucks—one belonging to Maya Ram and other belonging to Brij Bhushan. There were two jeeps one belonging to Stokes and the other belonging to Mrs. Amin Chand. Respondent used to bear to cost of diesel, etc. for these trucks and jeeps. These trucks and jeeps were used for carrying the voters as also for going to various villages for securing votes. I went in these trucks and jeeps from Jeori to Gharola; from Badar to Jeori; from Gharola to Rampur and from Rampur to Dattnagar. On 21st February, 1967, voters were brought in these trucks and jeeps from village Badar. These trucks then came to Gharola having brought voters from Gasoh. Thereafter the trucks came down to Rampur."

It will, therefore, be seen that this witness has gone even one better than the allegations made in the petition, because he has made a charge that the respondent had carried voters in these trucks and jeeps on the day of polling.

Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand whose jeep is alleged to have been used has not been produced in evidence. Lal Chand Stokes has also not been produced by the petitioner, but he has come as a witness for the respondent as R.W. 4. He has stated:—

"Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand is my mother-in-law. Her jeep was not provided to the respondent during the elections. I had asked her for the use of her jeep, but she had refused and had told me that I was opposing the Congress and, therefore, she would not let me touch any of her vehicles. She had been nominated and a member of the Territorial Council of Himachal Pradesh and she was also a member of Vidhan Sabha prior to the present election. She has always been and still is a member of the Congress party."

As to his own jeep he has stated:—

"I own a jeep and a pick-up van. I did not give any of these to the respondent for use during the elections. Once during the elections Dr. Dharam Sain asked for the use of my pick-up van for one day. He wanted the vehicle for coming to Simla from Rampur and going

back. After dropping Dr. Dharam Sain back at Rampur, the pick-up van came to me. Both these vehicles were being used by me during the elections to support the candidature of Jai Behari Lal Khachi, who was contesting the election to the Vidhan Sabha from Theog constituency. I did not charge Dr. Dharam Sain for his having used my pick-up van for going to Simla or back."

The cross-examination of this witness on this point has elicited the following answer:—

"I do not remember what journeys were undertaken and to what places between 20th of January, 1967 and 21st February, 1967, by my jeep and pick-up van. My answer is the same with regard to the jeep belonging to Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand. I know Dr. Dharam Sain very well. He was supporting the respondent during the elections. I had not accompanied him on the day when he had borrowed my pick-up van for one day."

Even if the testimony of Shyama Nand (PW. 16), and Sialu Ram (PW. 15) is accepted all that it amounts to is a more user of the jeep belonging to Lal Chand Stokes (RW. 4) by the respondent and his workers during the election. Mere user is not enough unless the amount, if any, incurred by the returned candidate on the vehicles is proved for the purposes of section 77 of the Act. In any case, the allegation with regard to the user of any jeep belonging to Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand is sufficiently displaced by the fact that she has not been produced in evidence and by the statement of Lal Chand Stokes (RW. 4) that she was a Congress worker and would not give any jeep for working against the Congress. As to pick-up van belonging to Lal Chand Stokes (RW. 4), all that can be said is that it was used for one day by Dharam Sain (RW. 5). There is no evidence at all of the respondent having spent any amount by way of petrol or diesel or salary of driver etc. The petitioner has completely failed to establish the allegations contained in paragraph 8(6) of the petition.

The next allegation is with regard to the engagement of a truck by the respondent. The allegation is contained in paragraph 8(7) of the petition which is as under:—

"The respondent had engaged for election purposes the truck of one Shri Maya Ram and had also used the trucks of Shri Brij Bhushan and the truck of Mehr Chand, Mul Raj. He has not shown the expenses for the same".

The reply of the respondent is contained in paragraph 8(7) of the written statement in these words:—

"Para 8(7) of the petition is wrong and denied. No trucks of any person were either hired or used by the respondent. Paragraph 8(7) of the replication states:—

"Sub-para (7) of para 8 of the written statement is wrong and that of the petition is correct and is reiterated. The three trucks were taken on hire and were actually used by the respondent as averred in sub-para (7) of para 8 of the election petition. The respondent has deliberately suppressed this fact and has not shown the expenses in the election expenses Return."

The petitioner has relied upon the statement of the very same witnesses, namely, Shyama Nand (PW. 16) and Sialu Ram (PW. 15) and my remarks with respect to these witnesses in connection with the allegations in paragraph 8(6) of the petition fully apply with respect to the allegations made in paragraph 8(7) of the petition and I hold that the petitioner has failed to make good the allegation in this paragraph.

The next alleged expense is the subject matter of paragraph 8(8) of the petition which states:—

"For his electioneering campaign, his workers and supporters visited various places. They had meals and drinks at Sarahan, Juri, Datnagar, Nogli, Jakhara, Dhar Gora, Taklech etc. These expenses which were of more than Rs. 500 have not been shown".

Paragraph 8(8) of the written statement says:—

"Para 8(8) of the petition is wrong and is denied. No expenses were paid by the respondent for his workers and supporters. It may be submitted that all the supporters of the respondent were in their local areas only and their services were voluntary".

Paragraph 8(8) of the replication is merely a reiteration of the allegations in paragraph 8(8) of the petition.

The only witness to support these allegations is Sialu Ram (PW. 15), who has stated:—

"I went to these villages for canvassing between 1st to 21st February, 1967. The respondent used to give the expenses incurred by me and these people. About Rs. 500 Rs. 600 were spent on the board of these people and another Rs. 500 to Rs. 600 were spent on travelling by buses and jeeps."

As I have held already, this witness is not a witness of truth. He seems to be sort of omnibus witness for the petitioner who has spoken about various allegations made in the petition. It is not possible to rely upon his testimony and I, therefore, hold that the petitioner has failed to make good the allegations made in paragraph 8(8) of the petition.

The next allegation is contained in paragraph 8(9) of the petition where it is alleged that the respondent spent about Rs. 500 upon his polling agents at 46 polling stations. It is not necessary to set out the pleadings of the parties in extense because there is no evidence worth the name so far as this allegation is concerned. Similarly there is no evidence to support the allegations contained in sub-para (10) to (12) of paragraph 8 of the petition which are set out here under:—

"(10) The respondent has not shown the expenses incurred on the day of the counting, including the expenses of the party given by him in the afternoon of 25-2-1967, the expenses for which were about Rs. 150.

(11) The respondent has deliberately shown such loss expense for wall posters and small posters as Rs. 350 only, while the expenses for them must have been more than Rs. 600.

(12) The respondent has not shown the expenses incurred on various other posters and hand-bills".

It is not necessary to set out the pleas of the respondent which are pleas of denial.

In the result, the petitioner has failed to prove any of the allegations made in paragraph 8 of the petition and Issue No. 2 is, accordingly, decided against the petitioner. Issue No. 3, as framed, is as under:—

"Whether the respondent has committed the corrupt practice of bribery by himself or through his agents or supporters with his consent as detailed in para 10 of the petition?

The allegations in paragraph 10 are:—

"That the respondent is guilty of corrupt practices of bribery as defined in clause (1) of section 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, particulars of which are given below, namely:—

(1) For the benefit, and with the consent of the

respondent meetings of the general members of the gram sabhas of Shingra, Sarahan and Dhar Gora were called and held. In these meetings Shri Bansi Lal who is President of the Tehsil Co-operative Union, Rampur, and who held out himself to be an active member of the recently formed body of persons known as Lok Raj Samiti, and Shri Dharam Sain, another active worker of the Lok Raj Samiti addressed the gatherings. With the object of inducing the voters to vote for the respondent, promises were held out that wheat and grains would be supplied free of cost as gratification. Consequently, from gifts of wheat and grain were made, the particulars and instances of which inter alia, are these:—

- (i) From 9th to 15th February, 1967, at Rampur from the Tehsil Co-operative Union, Rampur to various voters;
- (ii) on 19th and 20th February, 1967, at Nogli, through Shingla Co-operative Society to various voters;
- (iii) on 10th and 11th February, 1967, at Sarahan to various voters;
- (iv) on 11th and 12th February, 1967, at Dhar Gora.

(2) On behalf and with the consent of the respondent Shri Bansi Lal, ostensibly as Cashier, and Shri Dharam Sain as worker for the Lok Raj Samiti at Rampur made, amongst others, the following payments of cash with the object of inducing the voters to vote for the respondent, namely:—

- (i) On or about 10-2-1967 to Shri Jaggi Ram Rs. 100
- (ii) On or about 13-2-1967 to Shri Haria Ram Rs. 100
- (iii) On or about 10-2-1967 to Shri Lachmi Dass Rs. 200
- (iv) On or about 14-2-1967 to Shri Bhajan Dass Rs. 100
- (v) On or about 13-2-1967 to Shri Karam Dass Rs. 250

(3) The respondent and with his consent his agents and other persons with the object of inducing the voters to vote for the respondent from near about 1st to 18th February, 1967, during the electioneering campaign and visits to the places in the constituency lavishly entertained the people with alcoholic liquor drinks, the respondent who is a confirmed alcoholic liquor addict himself joining some of them.”

The reply of the respondent in paragraph 10 of the written statement is in these words:—

Para 10 of the petition is wrong and is denied. There is no corrupt practice committed by the respondent.

(1) Para 10(1) is wrong and is denied. The petitioner has not mentioned the time, place of the meeting held by the Gram Sabha apart from other particulars. It is wrong and is denied that any gatherings were addressed or the same were addressed with the consent of the respondent. No such promises were held out to anybody. In any case the respondent was no party to it. It is further wrong and denied that any wheat, grain, etc. was offered or distributed.

10(2) Para 10(2) of the petition is wrong and is denied. No amounts were distributed either by Shri Bansi Lal or by Shri Dharam Sain. It may be submitted that Sarvshri Jaggi Ram, Haria Ram, Lachhmi Dass, Bhajan Dass and Karam Dass were the workers and supporters of the petitioner. Further full particulars are not given.

10(3) Para 10(3) is wrong and is denied. Apart from being vague. The details of the alleged entertainment to the people are given. It is emphatically denied that the respondent is a confirmed alcoholic liquor addict. Further these allegations have been made to malign the respondent.”

Paragraph 10 of the replication says:—

“Para 10 of the written statement including its various sub-para, so far as they are contradictory and inconsistent with the various corresponding sub-para of the petition, is wrong and is repudiated. The averments made in para 10 of the petition including its sub-para are reiterated in full, being correct.

(1) Averments in sub-para (1) of para 10 of the petition are correct and are reiterated. Several meeting were held from 8th to 13th February, 1967 at Shingra, Sarahan and Dhargora. Other details are mentioned in the sub-para of the petition.

(2) Sub-para (2) of para 10 of the written statement so far as it is contradictory to sub-para (2) of the petition is wrong. It is denied that Sarvshri Jaggi Ram, Haria Ram, Lachhmi Dass, Bhajan Dass and Karam Dass or any one or more of them were the workers and supporters of the petitioner.

(3) Sub-para (3) of para 10 of the petition is correct and is reiterated; and that of the written statement is wrong and is denied. The respondent kept on entertaining the people from 1st to 18th February, 1967, from the objects mentioned in sub-para (3) of para 10 of the petition.”

In so far as the allegations contained in para 10(2) of the petition are concerned, the amounts alleged to have been paid to the persons named are the same which are mentioned in paragraph 8(5) of the petition which I have already dealt with. For the reasons recorded earlier with reference to the allegation made in paragraph 8(5) of the petition, I reject the petitioner's claim as made in paragraph 10(2) of the petition.

There is no reliable evidence with regard to the allegation made in paragraph 10(3) of the petition and I, therefore, reject the petitioner's claim in so far as these allegations are concerned.

With regard to the allegations made in paragraph 10(1) of the petition, the petitioner relies upon the testimony, amongst other witnesses of Jaggi Ram (P.W. 14), Sialu Ram (P.W. 15) and Shyama Nand (P.W. 16) whose testimony has been held by me to be unreliable in connection with the allegations made in paragraph 8(5) of the petition. These witnesses are interested witnesses and I am not prepared to rely upon their testimony in so far as the allegations contained in paragraph 10(1) of the petition are concerned. The next witness is Bali Ram, (P.W. 13). This witness also alleges himself to have been a worker of the respondent and yet he comes as a witness for the petitioner. A letter dated February 15, 1967 (Ex. P.6) is alleged to have been sent to this witness by Tej Ram (P.W. 12). By this letter Bali Ram (P.W. 13) is advised to contact Bansi Lal Vakil (R.W. 9) and to obtain wheat from him. My remarks with respect to the other letter Exhibits P.2 to P. 5 and exhibit PW. 4/2 substantially apply to this letter also which appears to have been manufactured for the purposes of this case. As to this letter, Tej Ram (P.W. 12) states that he did not meet the addressee and had sent this letter to Bali Ram (P.W. 13) through Nokhi Ram, a student, who was a nephew of Bali Ram (P.W. 13). The story told by this witness is that he was told by one Bali Bahadur Singh, amongst other things, to write to two people one of them being Bali Ram (P.W. 13)—to vote for the respondent.

He further says that Bali Bahadur Singh had asked this witness to convey this message orally. If that was the only message to be conveyed, I fail to understand why this witness brought in the question of supply of wheat in his letter Exhibit P.6. According to this witness, the letter Exhibit P.6. was intended to be on behalf of Negi Bali Bahadur Singh and himself, yet, in the beginning of the letter he does not mention the name of Negi Bali Bahadur Singh who was known to him and he merely says in the letter:—

“Submission is that the agent of Nalu Ram’s party has advised you that you and your men should see Bansilal Vakil and also obtain wheat from him.”.

and does not mention the name of Negi Bali Bahadur Singh as such agent. The witness explains that the name of Negi Bali Bahadur Singh is mentioned at the foot of the letter where it is stated:—

“We people also are in support of Nalu Ram Ji. One is Negi Bali Bahadur in his favour”.

The explanation of this witness is entirely unsatisfactory, and appears to be false. In my opinion, as stated already, this letter was also manufactured for the purposes of this case. In this view of the matter, no reliance can be placed upon the statement of Bali Ram (PW. 13) when he says that he took wheat without paying for it and wheat was distributed in the village without any body making payment because Bansilal (RW. 9) had told the Gram Sabha that they should vote for the respondent and they would all get wheat. This witness further states that wheat had been given to him by Bansilal. In cross-examination, this witness has admitted that he does not know Negi Bali Bahadur Singh, nor had he received any message or letter from him. He further admits that the respondent had met him but he does not say that any offer of wheat was made to this witness is completely useless to bring home the charge of distribution of wheat.

The next witness is Chet Ram (P.W. 19). He is the Vice President of the Dhar Gram Panchayat and he says that he was working for the Congress party during the last election. He alleges that Bansilal (RW. 9) had gone to the village and had said:—

“that wheat had arrived in Rampur and those who needed wheat should come to Rampur. He said that the wheat will be given to him who votes for the Azad party. The respondent was of the Azad Party.”.

This witness does not support the petitioner’s story of actual distribution of wheat and his statement cannot go to prove that allegation. Apart from this evidence, there is only the testimony of the petitioner himself and he tells an unusual story. He says:

“I was present in a meeting organised by the respondent’s workers in Shinghra Panchayat. Bansilal Advocate spoke in that meeting and asked for votes for the respondent and he promised wheat to the voters. Sawnu Ram, a voter, informed me that he had received 40 kilos of wheat from Bansilal, Advocate. A similar meeting was addressed by him in Dhara Gaura doing the same propaganda. Bali Ram (PW. 13) got 40 kilos of wheat from Bansilal Advocate.”

Sawnu Ram, who is alleged to have received 40 kilos of wheat has not been produced. Bali Ram (PW. 13) does not talk of the quantity of wheat that he received at Rampur. It seems to me that the petitioner has gone all out to support the allegations made by him in paragraph 10 (1) of the petition and has given particular of the quantity of wheat received by some persons even though those persons have not supported him in this behalf.

The evidence produced by the petitioner in support of the allegations in paragraph 10(1) of the petition can only be described as consisting of wild allegations and I do not see any reason why reliance should not be placed upon the testimony of Bansilal (RW. 9) an Advocate of Rampur, when he states:—

“I never promised nor actually distributed any wheat to any person or community as an inducement to cast votes in favour of the respondent at Dhar Gaura or any other place.”

I, therefore, hold that the petitioner has failed to prove Issue No. 3 which is decided against him.

Issue No. 4 is in these terms:—

“Whether the respondent or his agents published or made statements against the petitioner as detailed in para 11 of the petition, if so, its effect?”.

The allegations in paragraph 11 of the petition are:—

“That the respondent, his agents Sarvshri Bansilal, Dharamsain, Negi Thakur Sain, Balbhadar Negi, Hari Dass, Negi Sohan Lal, Negi Mohan Lal, Negi Gopi Nand, Bhola Singh etc., etc. appealed to the voters belonging to the higher (Swaran) castes in the constituency to desist from voting for the petitioner, alleging and stating that being a Harijan Koli the petitioner was so audacious as to style and give out himself as ‘Negi’ which epithet is exclusively used for and by the members of the higher castes of the locality of Rampur tehsil and Kinnaur district, enters the houses of and dines with Swaran Caste people as if they were his equals. They asserted that like low class scheduled caste people of the locality, the respondent, as enjoined by custom and dictates of caste and class distinctions, did not enter the houses of Swaran Caste people and did not claim or agitate for removal of untouchability and for equal status. They asserted that unlike the petitioner, the respondent did not go to the temples and did not take water from the springs which places are meant and reserved, so to say, only for Swaran Caste people. Such statements were made and propaganda was done between 1st and 18th February, 1967, and at these places:—

- (i) Gahan village, Bagalti, Panchayat area;
- (ii) Deothi Panchayat area;
- (iii) Nankhari village;
- (iv) Kashapath Panchayat area;
- (v) Ten Kothi Dhar Gora Panchayat area.
- (vi) Dofta Panchayat area;
- (vii) Pandrah-Bees Panchayat area;
- (viii) Nog Dansa Panchayat area;
- (ix) Munish Bali Panchayat area;
- (x) Taklech Panchayat area;
- (xi) Naryan Panchayat area;
- (xii) Khamadi, Surd Panchayat area;
- (xiii) Delth Panchayat area;
- (xiv) Datt Nagar Panchayat area;
- (xv) Kumsu Panchayat area;
- (xvi) Kimoo Panchayat area;
- (xvii) Sarahan Panchayat area;
- (xviii) Jahu, Khuni Panchayat area; and
- (xix) Rampur Municipality area”.

The respondent has replied to this allegation in paragraph 11 of the written statement in these words:—

“Para 11 of the petition is wrong and is denied apart from being vague. It is further submitted that the respondent does not know the person by the name of Shri Hari Dass. It is denied that any persons named in the para appealed to the voters belonging to the

higher caste in the constituency to desist from voting for the petitioner, alleging and stating that being a Harijan Koli the petitioner was so audacious as to style himself as Negi. Other allegations are also wrong and are denied. On the other hand it may be submitted that Negi Thakur Sen was himself a candidate for election from a Constituency where there were several Harijan voters. Further Sarvshri Bansi Lal and Dharam Sain are members of Political Party known as Lok Raj Samiti and they would and could not annoy the Harijan voters by making these reckless allegations. Further the respondent frequently mixed and dined with people of Swaran caste. No such propaganda in the villages mentioned in the petition or any other place was made."

Paragraph 11 of the replication is merely a reiteration of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the petition.

Two things are note-worthy—(1) That the constituency in question was a reserved constituency, that is constituency where the higher caste (Swaran caste) people would be in a minority and (2) that the appeal was made to this minority of higher caste people in order to win over their votes on the ground that the petitioner was so audacious as to behave as if he was an equal of the Swaran caste people. Such an appeal, even if it can be made by any sensible person, would not be made in public as is in evidence in this case because thereby the majority of the voters belonging to the lower caste are likely to vote against the person who indulged in such appeals or propaganda. The first of the witnesses who has come forward to support this allegation is Gian Chand (PW. 5). He is another witness who states that he was worker the respondent. Yet, he says that Negi Bali Bahadur went to the villages of Majyoli and Sah Gaon to canvass votes for the respondent saying:—

"That the respondent was a member of our own brotherhood whereas the petitioner being a Harijan was posing to be a Rajput and was visiting temples. He also stated that Basant Lal's wife was mad. I do not remember if he said anything more than what I have said today. The effect of that canvassing was that the members of Swaran Jati voted for the respondent."

Now the villages of Majyali and Shah Gaon are not mentioned in the petition. This witness admits in cross-examination that Bali Bahadur Negi had addressed meetings of the villagers. I find it difficult to believe that such a speech as is imputed to Negi Bali Bahadur could have been made in a meeting of the villagers where the majority must have been of people belonging to the lower caste. Apart from the fact that the allegations in para 11 of the petition are not wholly supported by this witness I do not find it possible to place any reliance upon his evidence.

The next witness is Hari Ram PW. (10). He is another witness who is supposed to have worked for the respondent in the elections. He states in examination-in-chief that he respondent told him that the petitioner was a *Kinaura* and the witness should have nothing to do with him. This is not the charge made in para 11 of the petition. In his further statement in examination-in-chief, this witness stated:—

"Kathu Ram said that the petitioner was a *Kinaura* and that we should not vote for him. Chandru Ram also said the same thing. Dhani Ram said that we were not going to vote for that *Sala Kinaura Chamar*. He is a scheduled caste and he would come up to our verandahs. He also said that the petitioner took himself to be a Negi. I do not know what Negis

are. The petitioner is a Harijan. These 4 persons told the high caste people of the village that the petitioner was a *Badmash* and the respondent was a good man, who know politics."

The name of Kathu Ram, Chandru Ram and Dhani Ram are not mentioned in para 11 of the petition. In any event, what these persons are alleged to have told this witness cannot by any stretch of imagination be in proof of the allegations made in para 11 of the petition. The evidence of this witness is utterly worthless to support the charge.

The next witness is Tej Ram (PW. 12). He is also a witness who alleged himself to have been a worker of the respondent at the instance of Negi Bali Bahadur Singh. His village is Manghara, which according to him, is in Dehda circle which is not mentioned as one of the places in paragraph 11 of the petition. He has stated that he had been told by Bali Bahadur Singh to vote for the respondent because "the petitioner was a bad man. He sat in his rest houses, he mixed with *Swaran* caste people and he does not bother about the poor people". It is not shown that his witness belongs to the *Swaran* caste. The charge is not for making the propaganda to the lower caste people but to the *Swaran* caste people. Apart from that, even if the witness is telling the truth, he does not support the charge as made in paragraph 11 of the petition.

The next witness is Sialu Ram (PW. 15). He has stated:—

"One election meeting which I attended was at Dhar Gaura. Bansi Lal, advocate, gave a speech at this meeting. He is present in Court to day. This meeting had been called for discussing the budget of the Panchayat. The budget was not discussed. Bansi Lal, Advocate, addressed the meeting and canvassed for votes for the respondent. Bansi Lal, advocate spoke against the petitioner. He said that the petitioner described himself as a Negi; that the threatened Government servants; he sat on a chair; he went to the houses of Rajputs and did not believe in untouchability. This is all that he said. After this speech some voters talked to me and told me that they will vote for the respondent."

Then again:—

"Mohan Lal, Sohan Lal, Dharam Sen and Negi Bali Bahadur Singh also spoke at various places against the petitioner. They said that the petitioner was a killer of cows, while the respondent was their protector. They also said that the money sanctioned by the Government for housing the Harijans was got cancelled by the petitioner."

So far as the meeting addressed by Bansi Lal, Advocate (RW. 9) is concerned, it is stated to be a meeting held at Dhar Gaura which is not a place mentioned in paragraph 11 of the petition. It is supposed to have been a general meeting where not only the *Swaran* caste but the Harijans were also present. This witness has admitted in cross-examination that a number of Harijans were present in the meeting addressed by Bansi Lal, Advocate; that there were large number of Rajputs and other persons also including Harijans. In fact this witness had gone to the extent of saying that Harijans used to be present in meetings where respondent's workers spoke against them. This fact, by itself, renders the evidence of this witness completely unworthy of reliance because it is difficult to believe that Bansi Lal, an Advocate, even if he was a supporter of the respondent would speak words which were likely to antagonise the Harijans present in the meeting. The fact that the petitioner described himself as a Negi or as belonging to the *Swaran* caste or went to the houses of Rajputs or did not believe in untouchability

would not antagonise the Harijans, but would rather make the petitioner their champion who was trying by himself to raise the social status of Harijans. Such propaganda could, by stretching the imagination, he said to antagonise the *Swaran* caste people. But it is not possible to believe that such words would be spoken or such propaganda carried on by the respondent or his supporters or workers in open meetings where the Harijans and the *Swaran* caste people were all present. In the subsequent portion of his statement, this witness has implicated Mohan Lal, Sohan Lal and Bali Bahadur Singh as having spoken against the petitioner at various places which are not specified. These persons are alleged to have said that the petitioner was a killer of cows and had been responsible for the cancellation of Government grant for housing the Harijans. These alleged statements are not the subject matter of the allegations in paragraph 11 of the petition and, apart from the fact, that the petitioner cannot take advantage of these allegations, these allegations made by the witness go to show the utter irresponsibility with which he made his statement in Court. I have already condemned his evidence in connection with other Issues and I condemn his evidence in connection with Issue No. 4 also.

The next witness Shyama Nand (PW. 16) has spoken about the meeting in Dhan Gaura. According to this witness, Bansilal in his speech said:—

“That the petitioner took himself to be Negi (Rajput); he goes to the houses of Rajputs and he does not believe in untouchability; that he goes to temples”.

For the reasons stated in connection with the evidence of Sialu Ram (PW. 15), the evidence of this witness also is unreliable and false.

The next witness is Kamla Nand (PW. 17) according to this witness:

“All the workers of the respondent used to say that the petitioner worked against Government servants; he did not believe in untouchability; he used to go to temples and to the houses of the Rajputs”.

These alleged statements are not stated by this witness to have been made only to the *Swaran* caste people which is the charge in paragraph 11 of the petition. They also do not support the allegations as made in that paragraph and the evidence of this witness also does not go to support either the making of the alleged statements or their having been made to the *Swaran* caste people only.

The next witness is Sant Lal (PW. 18) who also states himself to have been a worker of the respondent. He states that he himself used to speak at various villages and he told the voters:—

“That the petitioner was posing as a Negi and did not care for Rajputs nor for the poor people. He visits Rajput temples. My companions also told the voters the same thing. This propaganda had a tremendous effect. There is a custom amongst us Rajputs that we do not permit Harijans to our temples and water springs. Therefore, we Rajputs did not vote for the petitioner”.

This witness again said that Negi Thakur Sen had said “that no votes should be given to the petitioner because he poses to be a Negi and big man. Maya Ram said that votes should be given to the respondent because Thakur Sen said that the respondent was a good man.” In cross-examination he admits:—

“Negi Thakur Sen also said that the petitioner did not believe in untouchability. He did not say that the petitioner posed as a Rajput or went to the houses of Rajputs. Hundreds of people had attended this

meeting. Negi Thakur Sen used to be the Chief Secretary of Himachal Pradesh. I did not see any Harijan in this meeting. Karam Dass who used to accompany me is Harijan. He used to be with us when we carried out the propaganda that the petitioner did not believe in untouchability and was visiting Rajput houses. Karam Dass is the Vice-President of the Gram Panchayat Deleath.”

A bare reading of the statement of this witness shows how unreliable his testimony is. In any case, the fact that these alleged speeches were made in meetings where all the voters were present made the whole story absolutely unbelievable and find myself unable to place any reliance on the testimony of this witness.

Chet Ram (PW. 19) has spoken about a meeting held in Dhar Gaura village on February 12, 1967. In this evidence, this witness wants to implicate the respondent himself and alleges that the respondent “said a lot against the petitioner. He said that the petitioner was very dangerous man, he does not believe in untouchability; he goes every where to the temple or well or water spring; he goes to the *verandahs* of Rajputs and Brahmins. Rajput and Brahmins do not like Harijans doing all these things”. He has admitted in cross-examination that about 1,000/1,100 persons were present in this meeting including Harijans. This fact by itself is sufficient to condemn the testimony of this witness because no candidate in his senses would speak in a predominantly Harijan constituency in such a way as to lower the status of Harijans. I can place no reliance upon the testimony of this witness.

Karu Ram (PW. 20) also speaks about the meeting in Dhar Gaura held on February 12, 1967. He imputes a statement to Bansilal that Bansilal in his speech said that “votes should be given to the respondent and not to the petitioner. He said that the petitioner goes to bungalows and poses to be a Negi.” A comparison of the statement of this witness with the statement of Chet Ram (PW. 19) will show that the witness had really no idea of what he was talking about, particularly when it is admitted by this witness that a large number of Harijans were present in the meeting when Bansilal gave a speech.

I am then left with the statement of the petitioner himself. He has tried to improve matters. He has stated that the respondent and his workers told several Rajputs and Brahmins (whose names he does not disclose) that the petitioner posed as a Negi; touched the water springs and went to the temples; that he belonged to the Congress which did not believe in untouchability; that the respondent believed in untouchability and did not go to dwelling houses of the Rajputs. The petitioner said that amongst the Harijans, the respondent's propaganda against him was that he used to stay in rest house; that he was instrumental in stopping the subsidy which was given for Harijans; that he got cancelled the grant of Rs. 25,000 which was made by the Government for housing of Harijans in various places. The petitioner also said that he was told by the voters (whose names he does not disclose and whom he does not produce) that if the Congress nominee was elected, cows will be slaughtered and will not be protected. Even so, the petitioner himself does not support the allegations as they have been made in paragraph 11 of the petition. He seeks to make out that the respondent's workers carried out one type of propaganda amongst the Harijans and another type of propaganda amongst the *Swaran* caste people and in this he has not been supported by any of his witnesses, who have all stated that whatever was said by the respondent or his workers was said in open meetings where *Swaran* caste; Rajputs and Harijans were all present.

To my mind, the allegations made in paragraph 11 of the petition have not been substantiated to the slightest extent and the evidence which has been given is really contrary to the pleadings. I, therefore, decide Issue No. 4 against the petitioner.

Issue No. 5 is:—

“Whether the respondent has committed the corrupt practice of making and publishing by himself or through his agents or by any other persons with his consent or with the consent of his election agents statements of facts which are false or which they either believed to be false or did not believe to be true in relation to the personal character or conduct of the petitioner as detailed in para 12 of the petition?”

Para 12 of the petition on is these terms:—

“That the respondent, his agents, and with his connivance and consent, his supporters made and published the following statements of facts, which were false, in with respect to the conduct of the petitioner, namely:—

(i) Printed ‘Appeal’ posters in Hindi purporting to have been issued and published under the signatures of Shri Bansi Lal, Advocate, and Shri Dharam Sain, Pradhan Gram Panchayat Bhadawali, for themselves and purportedly by and for Girjanand Negi, President, Block Samiti Rampur, Gopinand Negi of Deothi, Shivsaran Singh President Gram Panchayat Sarahan, Bhagwan Dass Bhandari President Gram Panchayat Bahali, Damodar Dass President, Gram Panchayat Narayan, Kalu Ram, President Gram Panchayat Khuni Panauli, Lalit Mohan President Gram Panchayat Gori, were issued and published near about 12th February, 1967. In this, false statements with respect to the petitioner (who till the dissolution of the Himachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly prior to the recent General Elections was a sitting member since July, 1963, as member from Rampur Constituency were made to the effect:

The true representative of the people can only be he who deals with all humility and humbly and not he who, on getting the chair (seat) forthwith starts threatening, bullying, using filthy language and exerting undue pressure on Government Servants and on poor people and starts showing false arrogance. One of the candidates (meaning thereby the petitioner) for election to the Legislative Assembly even before contesting the election has stooped to demineering and various kinds of threatening. Voters themselves can conclude as to what such a person would be on winning the election. Hence, it is requested that do not ever elect such a person (meaning thereby the petitioner) as representatives.

(ii) It was falsely given out and propagated that for his personal gain, the petitioner had colluded with traders and got wheat and other grains sold to the public at excessively high rates. They falsely and wrongly asserted that Shri Nalu Ram after three days’ hunger strike (which hunger strike was a justification of their brains) and caused the bringing down of the rates.

(iii) They propagated the allegations that the petitioner did not properly treat his wife, who is suffering from mental disorder and so he could not be expected to do any good for the people.

(iv) They also asserted and propagated that the petitioner had fallen in disfavour with the Congress candidate

for Parliament namely Raja Bir Bhadra Singh of Rampur Bushahr and so the Raja desired the voters of Rampur constituency, while voting for him for the Parliament to vote for the respondent for the Assembly seat and not for the petitioner.

(v) They asserted and propagated that the petitioner was instrumental in getting an amount of Rs. 25,000, which had been sanctioned for setting up model bastis on subsidiary system for Harijans at Sarahan, Rampur and Kafti (Teen Kothi Dhar Gaon Panchayat Area) lapsed thereby depriving the poor Harijans of the opportunity and means for obtaining better housing. They falsely asserted and propagated also that the petitioner was instrumental in getting returned the grants meant for stipends and uniforms for Harijans school going children.

(vi) They falsely asserted and propagated that the Congress was against the banning of cow-slaughter, for which the people throughout the country according to them had agitated, and so the petitioner being a Congress candidate was also against the banning of cow-slaughter. They further asserted and propagated that as such the petitioner was not a true Hindu and did not deserve the votes of the people of the Constituency.”

The respondent has replied to these allegations in paragraph 12 of the written statement as follows:—

“Para 12(1) in reply to para 12(i) it is admitted that a poster was issued as an appeal by various Presidents of Panchayats but it is denied that the same was issued with the consent of the respondent. The contents as translated into English are not admitted to be correct. In any case, the alleged statement of fact did not in any manner prejudice the prospects of the petitioner in the election, nor such allegation of prejudice has been made in the petition. Further this statement does not relate to the personal character of the petitioner but related to the public conduct and as such is not a corrupt practice.

Para 12(2) is wrong and is denied. No such propaganda was made by any person. Further the details and better particulars, place and person who have alleged to have made the false allegations are not mentioned. Further the assertions of hunger strike of the respondent was correct, if made. In any case, a false assertion of this type is not a corrupt practice under the Act.

Para 12(3) is wrong and is denied apart from being vague. No such allegations were made by the petitioner or by any body also with the connivance of consent of the respondent.

Para 12(4) is wrong and is denied apart from being vague in any case, such an assertion is not a corrupt practice.

Para 12(5) is wrong and is denied apart from being vague. No such an assertion was made. In any case, such an assertion does not amount to a corrupt practice.

Para 12(6) is wrong and is denied. No such an assertion was ever made. The allegations are too vague. In any case such an assertion does not amount to a corrupt practice.” Para 12 of the replication states:—

“Sub-para (i) if para 12 of the election petition is correct and is reiterated in full while the corresponding sub-para in the Written Statement is wrong and is denied.” The statement did relate to the personal character of the petitioner and falls within the definition of the corrupt practice. It is further reiterated that the statement was made and published with the consent and actual connivance of the respondent and that the statement in fact did prejudice the prospects of the petitioner in his election.

Sub-para (ii) of para 12 of the written statement so far it is inconsistent with the corresponding sub-para of the petition is wrong and is repudiated. It is not necessary to mention all facts and evidence in the petition. Sub-para (iii) of para 12 of the written statement is wrong and that of the petition is correct and is reiterated.

Sub-para (iv) of para 12 of the petition is correct and is reiterated and that of the written statement is wrong and is denied. Sub-para (v) of para 12 of the petition is correct and is reiterated and that of the written statement is wrong and is denied. The statement does amount to corrupt practice and it prejudiced the election prospects of the petitioner to a great extent.

Sub-para (vi) of para 12 of the written statement is wrong and is denied; and that of the petition is correct and is reiterated. The false propaganda greatly prejudiced the prospects of the petitioner and falls within the definition of corrupt practice."

I may state here that there is no evidence at all with regard to the allegations made in sub-paragraphs 2(2), 12(3) and 12(4). With regard to the allegations made in sub-paragraphs 12(5) and 12(6), I have already held in dealing with Issue No. 4 that the witnesses who have been produced are not witnesses of truth.

So far as the allegations made in paragraph 12(1) are concerned, the appeal in question is a printed appeal in Hindi (Exhibit P.1=Exhibit PW. 2/1). With regard to the actual issuance of the appeal, there is no denial in paragraph 12(1) of the petition, but it is denied that appeal was issued with the consent of the respondent. The respondent has stated:—

"I did not have any knowledge about the appeal Ex. P.1 which I saw for the first time in Rampur after the elections. There is therefore, no question of its having been issued within my knowledge or with my consent. My answer is the same with reference to the statement Ex. P.1/1 in the appeal Ex.P.1. I did not pay anything for the printing of this appeal".

It is not possible to believe this statement of the respondent. It has been freely admitted by the admitted workers of the respondent like Bansilal, Advocate (RW. 9) and Dharam Sain (RW. 5) that this appeal was not only distributed in various parts of the constituency but that it was pasted and was even read out in various meetings addressed by the respondent's workers. It is enough to say that the respondent, Bansilal (RW. 9) and Dharam Sain (RW. 5) were all in Simla when the order for printing the appeal (Exhibit P. 1.) given to the press after a meeting between Bansilal and Dharam Sain in Balji's restaurant where the draft of the appeal to be printed was finalized. Dharam Sain (RW. 5) has admitted that he had come to Simla to give Ex.P.1 for printing, that the respondent had joined him at Nogli and had gone with him to Simla and had returned from Simla to Rampur with him. It is difficult for me to believe that in spite of the fact that he was with Dharam Sain for all this time, the respondent, did not know about the printing or the contents of the appeal. I, therefore, hold that the appeal Exhibit P.1 was printed with the knowledge and consent of the respondent.

The question, however, is whether the parties Exhibit P.1/1 in the appeal Exhibit P.1 is a statement of fact which was false, and which the respondent either believed to be false or did not believe to be true, in relation to the personal character or conduct of the petitioner and was a statement which was reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the petitioner's election within the

meaning of sub-section (4) of section 123 of the Act. I may further add that it is evident from the statement of Bansilal (RW. 9) that the offending part of the appeal Exhibit P.1 was directed against the petitioner. The short point which has, therefore, to be decided in so far as this Issue is concerned is whether the offending portion (Exhibit P.1/1) of the appeal (Exhibit P.1) was an attack against the personal character or conduct of the petitioner and was reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the petitioner's election.

The appeal purports to have been signed, *inter alia* on behalf of office bearers of various Panchayats in the constituency and that fact alone is sufficient to hold that if the offending portion is an attack against the personal character or conduct of the petitioner, it would certainly be reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of the petitioner's election.

This appeal is not only for the respondent, who was an independent candidate, but also for Raja Sahib Bir Bhadra Singh, who contested the election from this constituency as a Congress candidate for Parliament. The appeal in its beginning, specifies the qualities and qualifications which should be present in a representative of the people. It exhorts the quality and qualifications of Raja Sahib Bir Bhadra Singh. Then it specifies the achievements, qualities and qualifications of the respondent. It warns the electorate not to be taken in by the protestations of other candidates and it appeals to the voters to put their vote against the election symbols of the respondent and Raja Sahib Bir Bhadra Singh. The electorate is also warned not to give their vote to anybody else because for this mistake, the electorate will have to repent for 5 years. Then comes to offending portion which translated by me reads:—

"The real representative of the people is only he, who treats every body equally with humility and not he who, on getting the chair, starts threatening, bullying, abusing and exerting undue pressure on Government servants and poor people and showing false arrogance. One of the candidates for our Vidhan Sabha has, even before fighting the elections, started bullying and giving several types of threats. The voters can themselves decide what such a person would do on winning the election. Therefore, it is requested that such a person should under no circumstances be elected as your representative."

The gravamen of the charge is that the second sentence in the above translation is an attack against the personal character or conduct of the petitioner. In A.I.R., 1962 S.C. 1166 (*Inder Lal versus Lal Singh and others*), the Supreme Court has dealt with the scope of sub-section (4) of section 123 of the Act. This is what the Supreme Court has said:—

"It would be noticed that in prescribing the requirement that the false statement should have relation to the personal character of the candidate, a distinction is intended to be drawn between the personal character of the candidate and his public or political character. The provision postulates that if a false statement is made in regard to the public or political character of the candidate, it would not constitute a corrupt practice even if it is likely to prejudice the prospects of that candidate's election. This assumption is presumably based on the theory that the electorate being politically educated and mature, would not be deceived by a false criticism against the public or political character of any candidate. The public and political character of a candidate is open to public view and public criticism and even if any false state-

ments are made about the political views of a candidate or his public conduct or character, the electorate would be able to judge the allegations on the merits and may not be misled by any false statements of fact affecting the public or political character of a candidate are not brought within the mischief of S.123(4). In order that the elections should be free, it is necessary that the electorate should be educated in political issues, in a fearless manner and so, the Legislature thought that full and ample scope should be left for free and fearless criticism by candidates against the public and political character of their opponents".

But the position with regard to the private or personal character of the candidate is very different. Circulation of false statements about the private or personal character of the candidate during the period preceding elections is likely to work against the freedom of election itself in as much as the effect created by false statements cannot be met by denials in proper time and so the constituency has to be protected against the circulation of such false statements which are likely to affect the voting of the election. That is why it is for the protection of the constituency against acts which would be fatal to the freedom of election that the statute provides for the inclusion of the circulation of false statements concerning the private character of a candidate amongst corrupt practices. Dissemination of false statements about the personal character of a candidate thus constitutes a corrupt practice.

Though it is clear that the statute wants to make a broad distinction between the public and political character on the one hand and private character on the other, it is obvious that a sharp and clear-cut dividing line cannot be drawn to distinguish the one from the other. In discussing the distinction between the private character and the public character, sometimes reference is made to the "man beneath the politician" and it is said that if a statement of fact affects the man beneath the politician it touches private character and if it affects the politician, it does not touch his private character. There may be some false statements of fact which clearly affect the private character of the candidate, if, for instance, it is said that the candidate is a cheat or murderer there can be no doubt that the statement is in regard to his private character and conduct and so if the statement is shown to be false, it would undoubtedly be a corrupt practice. Similarly, if the economic policy of the party to which the candidate belongs or its political ideology is falsely criticised and in strong words it is suggested that the said policy and ideology would cause the ruin of the country, that clearly would be criticism, though false, against the public character of the candidate and his political party and as such, it would be outside the purview of the statute. But there may be cases on the border-line where the false statement may affect both the politician and the man beneath the politician and it is precisely in dealing with cases on the border-line that difficulties are experienced in determining whether the impugned false statement constitutes a corrupt practice or not. If, for instance, it is said that in his public life, the candidate has utilized his position for the selfish purpose of securing jobs for his relations, it may be argued that it is criticism against the candidate in his public character and it may also be suggested that it nevertheless affects his private character. Therefore, it is clear that in dealing with corrupt practices alleged under S.123(4) where we are concerned with border-line cases, we will have to draw a working line to distinguish private character from public character and it may also have to be borne in mind that in some cases, the false statement may affect both the private and the

public character as well.

The Supreme Court has also occasion to define the approach which has to be made in construing statements made in election posters in A.I.R. 1965, S.C. 141 (*Kuldar Singh versus Mukhtiar Singh*), wherein the Supreme Court observes:—

"That takes us to the question of construing the impugned poster. The principles which have to be applied in construing such a document are well settled. The document must be read as a whole and its purport and effect, determined in a fair, objective and reasonable manner. In reading such documents, it would be unrealistic to ignore the fact that when election meetings, are held and appeals are made by candidates of opposing political parties, the atmosphere is usually surcharged with partisan feelings and emotions and the use of hyperboes or exaggerated language, or the adoption of metaphors, and the extravagance of expression in attacking one another, are all a part of the game; and so, when the question about the effect of speeches delivered or pamphlets distributed at election meetings is argued in the cold atmosphere of a judicial chamber, some allowance must be made and the impugned speeches or pamphlets must be construed in that light. In doing so, however, it would be unreasonable to ignore the question as to what the effect of the said speech or pamphlet would be on the mind of the ordinary voter who attends such meetings and reads the pamphlets or hears the speeches. It is in the light of the well-established principles that we must now turn to the impugned pamphlet".

The first sentence of the impugned statement is undoubtedly general in character. Equally undoubtedly it specifies the qualifications of a true representative of the people and it also specifies the disqualifications which disentitle a man from being called a true representative of the principle. This sentence can, therefore, by no stretch of imagination, be in relation to the personal character or conduct of the petitioner and it applies equally to all the contesting candidates. The second sentence says that even before being elected, one of the candidates (meaning the petitioner) has started indulging in bullying and threats. This statement has to be understood in the context of the statement contained in the immediately preceding sentence because it has a direct relation thereto. If it has such a direct relation, then it must necessarily be in connection with personal character or conduct but with public or political character because the implication is that when that particular candidate has started bullying and threatening even before the election, he is likely to indulge in the same type of actions upon his election. If the first two sentences are read together, as they should be, there is no doubt that the statement even in the second sentence is about the public conduct or character and not about the personal or private conduct or character. If that is so, the exhortation to the voters in the third and fourth sentences would be a legitimate exhortation or appeal. In my view, it is not possible to say that any part of the impugned portion of the appeal Exhibit P.1 can be said to be in relation to the personal conduct or character of the petitioner. The petitioner, therefore, fails on Issue No. 5, which is decided against him.

Issue No. 6 is as follows:—

"Whether the respondent has been guilty by himself or through his agents or by any other person without his consent or with the consent of his election agent, of the corrupt practice of procuring and using two jeeps and two trucks for the purpose of carrying voters at his expenses to the polling station on the date of

polling as detailed in para 13 of the petition. If so, what is its effect?"

Paragraph 13 of the petition has given rise to this Issue and that paragraph is in these terms:—

"That the respondent for the use of the voters for going to the various polling stations on the polling day procured and used two jeeps and two trucks for carrying the voters at his expenses not at the expense of the voters, particularly for the following polling stations:—

- (i) Neerath-Bhera.
- (ii) Datt-Nagar.
- (iii) Jhakhri.
- (iv) Sarahan-Juri.
- (v) Jahu".

Paragraph 13 of the written statement contains the respondent's reply to this allegation which is in these terms:

"Para 13 of the petition is wrong and is denied apart from being vague. No trucks were ever engaged by the respondent for any purpose whatsoever. The petitioner has not given particulars are required by law".

Paragraph 13 of the replication states:—

Para 13 of the Written Statement is wrong and that of the petition is correct and is reiterated. Two jeeps belonging to Mrs. Subhadra Amin Chand and Shri Lal Chand Stokes respectively and two trucks of Shri Maya Ram and Krishan mentioned above were used by the respondent for carrying the voters to the polling stations mentioned in the para".

It will be noticed that the names of the owners of the jeeps and of the trucks have been disclosed for the first time in the replication and the names of the owners of the jeeps are the very same as given in paragraph 8(6) of the replication in connection with Issue No. 2 while discussing Issue No. 2, I have held that the respondent has not been proved to have engaged or incurred any expenses in the engagement of the two jeeps and the two trucks. The necessary consequence of that finding is that petitioner fails on Issue No. 6 also.

Issue No. 7 as framed runs thus:—

"Whether the respondent by himself or through his agents or through any other person with his consent or with the consent of the election agents obtained or procured the assistance of Government servants for the furtherance of the prospects of his election and is thus guilty of the corrupt practices as detailed in para 14 of the petition?"

This Issue has been framed on the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the petition which runs thus:—

"Thus the respondent obtained and procured himself and by his agents and other persons with his consent the assistance of Government Servants for the furtherance of his prospects as a candidate. Particulars, *inter-alia*, are as follows:—

- (1) Two Gram Sewaks under Block Development Officer of Rampur;
- (2) Secretaries, Gram Panchayats Sarahan and Shingla;
- (3) Peon P.W.D., Sarahan;
- (4) Chowkidar, Rest House, Dhar Gora;
- (5) Principal, Government College, Rampur;
- (6) S.D.O., P.W.D., Jeori as Presiding/Polling Officer, who openly pointed out to the voters and asked them to vote for the respondent only at the places and for the symbol of the respondent on the ballot paper; and
- (7) Shri Ramanand, Naib Tehsildar, Rampur".

The reply of the respondent is contained in paragraph 14 of the written statement:—

"Para 14 of the petition is wrong and denied and is vague to the extreme. It is not mentioned how and in what manner the assistance of the various Government Servants was obtained for furtherance of his prospects as a candidate. Further there are several Gram Sewaks in Block Development of Rampur and several peons of P.W.D., Sarahan and the respondent does not know the particular people who alleged to have assisted the respondent. In any case, it is denied that any type of assistance was taken by the respondent".

Paragraph 14 of the replication is in these words:—

"Para 14 of the written statement is wrong and is repudiated. Para 14 of the election petition is correct and is reiterated. The particulars have already been given in para 14 of the election petition but to amplify further it is stated that following were the Government servants who helped the respondent in the furtherance of his prospects as a candidate:—

- (1) (i) Shri Laiq Ram Gram Sewak, Deothi, P.O. Deothi, Rampur;
- (ii) Shri Mangat Ram, Gram Sewak, Sarahan, Rampur;
- (2) (i) Shri Shiv Ram, Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Sarahan, Rampur;
- (ii) Shri Ghetan Ram, Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Shingla, Rampur;
- (3) Shri Thonku Ram, Peon, P.W.D., Jeori, Rampur;
- (4) Shri Singhi Ram, Chowkidar, Rest House, Dhar Gora;
- (5) Shri Sachdev, Principal Government College, Rampur;
- (6) Shri R. S. Bhatnagar, S.D.O., P.W.D., Jeori, Rampur Bushahr; and
- (7) Shri Ramanand, Naib Tehsildar, Rampur".

It is urged that the respondent has committed the corrupt practice contemplated by sub-section (7) of section 123 of the Act, which is in these terms:—

"The obtaining or procuring of abetting or attempting to obtain or procure by a candidate or his agent or, by any other person with the consent of a candidate or his election agent, any assistance other than the giving of vote for the furtherance of the prospects of the candidate's election, from any person in the service of the Government and belonging to any of the following classes, namely:—

- (a) stipendiary judges and magistrates;
- (c) members of the armed forces, of the Union;
- (d) members of the police forces;
- (e) excise officers;
- (f) revenue officers other than village revenue officers, known as lambardars, malguzars, patels, desh-mukhs or by any other name, whose duty is to collect land revenue and who are remunerated by a share of, or commission on, the amount of land revenue collected by them but who do not discharge any police functions and;
- (g) such other class of persons in the service of the Government as may be prescribed".

The corrupt practice comprises of "the obtaining or procuring or abetting or attempting to obtain or procure" the assistance of the Government servants who are specified in the sub-section.

The petitioner has produced Bali Ram (PW. 13) who states that Singhi Chowkidar who is an employee of the P.W.D., in a Dak Bungalow came to him on the day of election and asked him to vote for the respondent.

Assuming that Singhi Chowkidar is one of the persons mentioned in sub-section (7) of section 123 of the Act, the evidence of the witness does not go to show or prove that what Singhi Chowkidar did was not of his own but because the respondent has obtained or procured his assistance. The next witness is Sialu Ram (PW. 15) who alleges himself to have worked for the respondent during the elections. His testimony has already been condemned by me in connection with other Issues. He states:—

“When I went to Kartol, I was accompanied by guard Chuhra Ram. Chuhra Ram is a Government servant, when I went to village Dhar Gaura, I was accompanied by Singhi Ram, Chowkidar in the Public Works Department.....when I went to Chidali, I was accompanied by Chuhra Ram.”

This witness also does not prove that the assistance of Chuhra Ram or Singhi Chowkidar was obtained or procured by the petitioner. The next witness is Kamla Nand (PW. 17). He states:—

“I was at Jeori polling booth. The Presiding Officer of that polling booth used to talk to the voters not to vote for the Congress. “Lion” was the symbol of the respondent while the “Bullock” of the Congress. The clerk of the presiding officer used to catch hold of the ballot paper and told the voters to fix the stamp against the lion symbol which was at the top of the ballot paper. I protested about this to the presiding officer.”

This statement also does not establish that even if what the Presiding Officer and the Clerk of the Presiding Officer did amount to assistance, such assistance was obtained or procured by the respondent.

The next witness is Karu Ram (PW. 20). He merely states that Singhi Ram, probably meaning the Chowkidar, was a worker of the respondent and had come to a meeting held in Dhar Gaura on February 12, 1967. This witness also does not satisfy the requirement of sub-section (7) of section 123 of the Act.

The petitioner himself has stated:

“The Sub-Divisional Officer at Jeori who was the election incharge was also working for the respondent. At Sarahan the Sub-Divisional Officer and a *Chaprasai*

of the Public Works Department were working for the respondent. In Dhar Gaura the Chowkidar of the Public Works Department rest-house was working for the respondent. In Defda, Laiq Ram, a Gram Sewak, was working for the respondent. In Rampur, Ramanand, Naib-Tehsildar was working for the respondent. In Jeori and Gharola the Government servants used to show the three columns on the ballot papers to the voters and used to indicate the name of the respondent which was at the top, then my name and then the name of Saran Dass and they used again to indicate the name of the respondent with a pencil thereby indicating by signs that votes should be cast in favour of the respondent. The Chowkidar of the Public Works Department rest-house at Dhar Gaura and the peon of the Public Works Department in Sarahan used to canvass in the village for votes for the respondent, Ramanand, Naib Tehsildar used to canvass for votes for the respondent. Laiq Ram, Gram Sewak also used to canvass for the votes for the respondent”.

There is not a word in this testimony that assistance of any of these people had been obtained or procured by the respondent. The petitioner, therefore, fails on Issue No. 7 also.

In the result, the petition is dismissed with costs. In view of the fact that the respondent has not been believed by me with regard to the printing of the appeal (Ex. P.1) and also with regard to its publication in the constituency, he is not entitled to his full costs and I assess his cost at Rs. 750.

The Registrar shall comply with the provisions of section 103 of the Act.

January 16, 1968.

Sd/-
S. N. ANDLEY,
Judge.

By order,
D. B. LAL,
Chief Electoral Officer.

अनुपूरक

शून्य

PART I

देहली हाई कोर्ट NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 19th September, 1969

No. 69/RHC/F. Judl. I(HIM.).—The Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Judges have been pleased to make the following posting and transfer in the public interest:—

Serial No.	Name of the officer	From	To	Remarks
1.	Shri B. D. Sharma	On return from leave.	Mahasu at Simla.	As District and Sessions Judge, Mahasu at Simla from the date he assumes charge vice Shri Kedar Ishwar

By order,
GURU DATTA,
Registrar.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT (TREASURIES AND ACCOUNTS ORGANISATION) NOTIFICATION

Simla-2, the 10th October, 1969

No. 20-11/64-Fin. (T&A).—In partial modification of para 2 of this Department Notification of even number, dated the 17th September, 1969, transfer of Shri Chet Ram, Treasury Officer, Lahaul and Spiti District at Keylong to Mandi is hereby cancelled. He will now continue to work as Treasury Officer, Lahaul and Spiti District at Keylong as heretofore. Shri Dev Raj Gupta is hereby posted as Treasury Officer, Mandi against a newly created post instead of Treasury Officer, Lahaul and Spiti District at Keylong as ordered earlier.

P. R. MAHAJAN,
Secretary.

PART II**OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
KANGRA.***Dated the 14th October, 1969.*

No. 2599/LF.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 23(i) of the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Act, 1968, read with rule 41 of the Municipal Election Rules, 1952, it is hereby notified that the following persons have been elected as members of the Municipal Committee, Nurpur, in Kangra district.

Sl. No.	Ward No.	Name and address of the members elected.
1.	I.	Shri Dev Datt s/o Ram Lal, Shop-keeper, Mohalla Chowgan, Nurpur.
2.	II.	Shri Khushal Chand, Ward No. 2, Nurpur.
3.	III.	Shri Nanak Chand, Ward No. 3, P.O. Nurpur.
4.	IV.	Shri Om Parkash, Ward No. 4, Nurpur.
5.	V.	Shri Om Parkash, Lambi Gali, Nurpur.
6.	VI.	Shri Ram Chand, Ward No. 5, P.O. Nurpur.
7.	VII.	Shri Satya Paul, Advocate, Nurpur.
8.	VIII. (Reserve)	Shri Gian Chand, Ward No. 8, Nurpur.
9.	IX.	Shri Balwant Raj, Gali Karolan, Nurpur.

Y. L. RAJWADE,
Deputy Commissioner.